DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 145 066 UD 017 429

TITLE	Project Student Concerns. Interim Report.
INSTITUTION	Jefferson County Education Consortium, Louisville, Ky.
SPONS AGENCY	Kentucky Univ., Lexington.; Louisville Univ., Ky.
PUB DATE	14 Sep 77
NOTE	218p.; Some tables may be marginally legible due to the print quality of the original document.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$11.37 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrator Attitudes; *Black Students; Discipline; *High School Students; Inequalities; Parent Attitudes; Public Schools; *Racial Discrimination; *School Integration; Senior High Schools; Student Attitudes; Surveys; *Suspension; Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS	*Kentucky (Jefferson County); *Kentucky (Louisville)

ABSTRACT

This report investigates the disproportionately high suspension rate of black high school students in the newly integrated Louisville-Jefferson County school district. Data were obtained as a result of interviews with 24 administrators, 84 teachers, and 49 suspended students and their parents. The report concludes: (1) Black students are more likely to be suspended than white students for all offenses except class cutting; (2) Black and white students seem to be equally informed of school rules, though some faculty members suggest students' ignorance of the rules as a reason for disproportionate black student suspensions; (3) Parents feel suspension is too frequently used. All groups interviewed agree that loss of instructional time is the most negative aspect of suspension and that behavior posing the threat of injury to others should result in suspension. Opinions as to what should be other suspendable offenses varied widely among the four groups interviewed; (4) Faculty and administration tended to similarly explain disproportionate suspensions of black students. Most frequently cited reasons were related to racially assigned attributes; (5) Data from this and other studies conducted in the same district indicate unequal application of discipline in the schools. The report makes recommendations for remedying the problem of disproportionate suspension of black students. (Author/GC)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

4

ED145066

UD017429

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Jefferson County Education Consortium 502/581-4561 • 675 River City Mall Louisville, Kentucky 40202
Sponsored By: University of Louisville, University of Kentucky, Jefferson County Public Schools

September 14, 1977

Mr. David Lerch
Program Officer
Special Project Grants EEOP
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
Room 2017
Washington, D.C. 20202

Dear Mr. Lerch:

Grant number G007603821 requires by reference that an Interim Report be transmitted to ESAA by 30 September 1977. That report is herewith transmitted to your office.

The report contains primarily a description of the work done in Phase I of the project. Phase II has been implemented and the results will be forthcoming in the final report due at the end of the project period. We have experienced some difficulties in accurately determining probable causes for the disproportionate suspension of minority students. It is hoped that the installation of a new information system for suspensions will be implemented by the school district so that our findings may be more conclusive.

If you have any questions regarding this report, please feel free to contact me.

Regards,

Frank Bickel

Frank Bickel
Project Director

tdl

fferson County Education Consortium 502/581-4561 • 675 River City Mall Louisville, Kentucky 40202
ONSORED BY: UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE / UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY / JEFFERSON COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

INTRODUCTION 1

SECTION I: Review of the Literature 5

SECTION II: Methodology 51

SECTION III: Results 67

SECTION IV: Findings 79

SECTION V: Conclusions 91

SECTION VI: Recommendations 97

SECTION VII: Tables 101

- School district cumulative 103
- Individual school 111

SECTION VIII:Bibliography 161

INTRODUCTION

INTRODUCTION

The Jefferson County, Kentucky public schools entered the 1975-76 academic year under a court order to bring an end to de jure segregation. An extended period of litigation preceded the desegregation order. Federal District Court Judge Gordon, after a series of appeals and delays, was ordered to implement a desegregation plan by September 4, 1975.

The desegregation order followed the merger of the Louisville Independent School District with the Jefferson County Public Schools. Merger of the two districts had been requested by the former, and was ultimately accomplished in April, 1975, as ordered by the State Board of Education.

The merger of two very different school systems created anxiety and ambiguity which was felt throughout the system. Desegregation of this newly merged school district added difficulties of adjusting to altered ethnic balances in enrollments to an already anxious and ambigious situation. These factors, merger and desegregation, in all probability contributed to the increase in student suspensions, especially among Black students.

An examination of suspension data for 1975-76 reveals that a relatively small number of schools account for a large percentage of the total suspensions reported. There was evidenced a wide disparity between schools in the number and eth-sex proportions of suspended students. Data from other desegregated systems suggests that attitudes of parents, students, and school personnel in the various school communities has a profound impact on the successful desegregation of individual schools. Those schools that experienced excessive disruption and disproportionate suspension rates for minority students likely maintained or permitted a set of conditions that contributed to those problems.

Staff of the Jefferson County Education Consortium secured approval of the Superintendent to prepare a proposal for submission to ESAA for a more in-depth study of suspensions, including testing several strategies for reducing minority suspensions.

Project Student Concerns was funded in May, 1976, with the University of Kentucky Research Foundation as grantee. The project is managed by the Jefferson County Education Consortium, in cooperation with the Jefferson County Public Schools.

SECTION I

Review of the Literature

LITERATURE REVIEW

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this literature review on suspension and related factors in desegregated schools is to provide a framework from which to view the results of the study. Having obtained an understanding of trends, existing problems and attitudes, and exemplary programs which have been or are presently operative in desegregated schools, the project's findings may be viewed in a broader context.

It should be recognized that this literature review is not intended to be an exhaustive review of suspension and desegregation literature, and has, therefore, been limited to five areas. Furthermore, within these areas only that literature which has been judged to be most relevant has been included. The five areas are:

A) A survey of past court decisions and current laws determining legal procedures to be followed in public school suspension.

B) Trends in suspension in other districts.

C) Types of offenses for which students are most frequently suspended.

D) Disciplinary alternatives to suspension used in other school districts.

E) Attitudes of students and teachers which contribute to suspension rates.

SECTION A: THE LAW AND SCHOOL SUSPENSIONS

Historically school districts have used student suspension as a mechanism to control student behavior. In many instances this method of exclusion violated basic rights of students as guaranteed by the United States Constitution. However, in more recent years considerable concern and attention have been directed toward the protection of human rights. This new awareness has prompted legislation and court action directed toward safeguarding individual rights. Included in this process have been significant legal decisions relative to the rights of elementary and secondary students. The following review details court actions which demonstrate trends and policies related to student suspensions.

The Fourteenth Amendment is cited as the basis of the Supreme Court decision in West Virginia State Board of Education v. Barnette, which denounced the expulsion of a student for refusing to salute the flag:

> The Fourteenth Amendment, as now applied to the States, protects the citizens against the State itself and all its creatures, boards of education not excepted. These have, of course, important, delicate, and highly discretionary functions, but none that they may not perform within the limits of the Bill of Rights. That they are educating the young for citizenship is reason for scrupulous protection of constitutional freedoms of the individual, if we are not to strangle the free mind at its source and teach youth to discount important principles of our government as mere platitudes (page 637).

In addition, to the guarantees of the Fourteenth Amendment, the First Amendment supports student's rights. Two justices explained with the following statement:

> Words uttered under coercion are proof of loyalty to nothing but self-interest. Love of country must spring

> from willing hearts and free minds, inspired by a fair administration of wise laws enacted by people's elected representatives within the bounds of express constitutional prohibitions. These laws must, to be consistent with the First Amendment, permit the widest toleration of conflicting viewpoints with a society of free men (West Virginia State Board of Education v. Barnette, 319, U.S. 644, 1943).

Ackerly (1970) credited the West Virginia State Board of Education v. Barnette decision as being the turning point in the jurisprudence relating to the student's status in schools as earlier decisions support strict control by school authorities (page 20).

Ackerly (1970) cites the Carr v. Dighten and Pugsley v. Sellmeyer cases as examples of the early support of school officials by the court (page 22). In the 1918 Carr v. Dighten case, the decision of school officials to suspend a student with head lice was upheld (p. 525). The court upheld the decision of school administrators to expel an 18 year old female student who insisted upon using talcum powder on her face in the Pugsley v. Sellmeyer case, (page 538).

Following the Barnette decision, constitutional rights of student's were more closely observed. In 1966, the New York State Commissioner of Education ruled that a school board could not prohibit a girl student from wearing slacks to school assuming they were neat and not indecent (Ackerly, 1969, p. 24).

In 1965, a group of Black students in Mississippi were suspended for wearing buttons inscribed with the words "Freedom Now". Challenged in federal court, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit reinstated the students explaining that evidence of a significant disruption of the educational process resulting from the wearing of buttons was not present and, therefore, no legal basis for suspending the students was apparent (Glasser 1969, p. 192).

The 1969 Tinker v. Des Moines Independent Community School Districts dealt with the 1967 suspensions of three students for wearing black armbands protesting the war in Vietnam (p. 733). The parents of the involved students filed suit in Federal Court, but the U.S. Court of Appeals of the Eighth Circuit upheld the principal's decision. In 1969, the Supreme Court reversed the lower courts decision and upheld the student's right to wear armbands in accordance with the First Amendment (Glasser, 1969, p. 192).

Perhaps the most highly publicized recent court decision regarding student suspension is that of Goss v. Lopez which occurred in 1975 (p. 729). An over-ruled Ohio law gave school officials the authority to suspend a student for ten days or less without giving the student or parent advance notice of the suspendable offense.

In 1971, Columbus schools were affected by racial disturbances and school principals took advantage of the suspension law. At Central High School, 75 students, regarded as troublemakers, were suspended, given zeros on missed classwork, and some received unsolicited transfers to other schools or to an adult day school. There were no hearings and several were never given reasons for their suspension (Nolte, 1975, p. 47).

Nine students who had not received hearings filed legal action against the Columbus Board of Education and several administrators. The complaint sought to abolish the "short-suspension" law stating it was in conflict with the Fourteenth Amendment as it permitted the administrator to disallow the student educational opportunities without a hearing. The plaintiffs also sought to require administrators to remove references to past suspensions from the involved student's school records.

The District Court declared the students were denied due process since they were suspended without a hearing. The court also held that suspensions under the then existing law were unconstitutional. References to the student's past suspensions were removed from their school records (Draba, 1975, p. 1).

Administrators appealed to the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court upheld the lower court's decision and clarified procedures for cases of students threatened with a suspension of ten days or less.

The court required that any student facing suspension must at least be given:

1. Oral or written notice of the charges against him and a hearing;
2. An opportunity to hear the evidence the authorities have and an opportunity to respond if the student denies the charges; and
3. Notice and hearing before the student is removed from the school (Draba, 1975, p. 2)

According to Justice Byron White:

> The hearing can be informal and should precede suspension unless the student's presence in school threatens persons, property or orderly academic processes. In that case, the student may be suspended immediately but the hearing must follow as soon as practicable (Student Suspensions: Perilous Precedent?" 1975, p. 51).

An additional aspect of court intervention in school disciplinary actions is related to situations where a particular group of students experience a disproportionate number of suspensions. Such is the case of Hawkins v. Coleman (1974) for the Dallas Independent School District (p. 376).

In August of 1971, the Dallas Independent School District began the implementation of school desegregation orders of the U.S. District Court in Tasky v. Estes (p. 342). Following the implementation, it became apparent the number of students being suspended from school was on the increase and that the increase was more significant for Black students in numbers and severity of suspension.

An analysis of the problem resulted in the following conclusions:

1. Individual Black students were denied due process.
2. Most suspensions were not in compliance with school policy,
3. The school policy actually denied due process,
4. Even with the use of due process, Black students would still receive a disproportionate number of school suspensions due to institutional bias (Demarest and Jordon, 1975, p. 20).

On March 20, 1972, Delbert Hawkins was involved in an incident with a white student. Both were suspended for ten days. On the same day, the principal called Mrs. Hawkins, Delbert's mother, to attend a meeting on the following day. At the conclusion of the meeting, the principal presented suspension documents (which had been prepared before the meeting) for an indefinite time period to Mrs. Hawkins.

In April of 1972, the Hawkins family filed suit claiming Delbert had been denied procedural due process in his suspension. Consistent with the Goss v. Lopez decision, the District court granted Delbert Hawkins a preliminary injunction reinstating him in school, concluding he was denied due process and that the Dallas Independent School District suspension policy was unconstitutional (Demarest and Jordan, 1975, p. 27).

The plaintiffs continued efforts in their lawsuit, obtaining statistical information from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare's Office of Civil Rights. Suspension figures of the Dallas Independent School District indicated a total of 2,860 Black suspensions out of a Black student population of 7,842, compared to 2,972 white student suspensions out of a total white population of 16,433. (Demarest and Jordan, 1975, p. 28).

Dr. Scott Kester, an educational psychologist, was employed to evaluate the statistics. Based upon Kester's report, Judge Sarah Hughes cited "institutional racism" as the chief cause of the disproportionate number of Black students being suspended from Dallas Independent School District schools (Demarest and Jordan, 1975, p. 31).

Goss v. Lopez raised the issue of whether notice and hearing are required prior to student suspensions lasting longer than ten days. Another landmark case, Wood v. Strickland, involved the related issue of the standard of proof needed to suspend a student and raised the ancillary question of whether school board members can be sued personally for monetary damages for participating in improper suspension of a student. (Flygare, 1974, p. 257).

In Wood v. Strickland (1974) three female students were suspended for allegedly "spiking" punch at a school activity (p. 1932). They were later expelled by the Board of Education who conducted a hearing without the presence of the students or their parents. No evidence of the alcoholic content of the beverage used to "spike" the punch was obtained. The supreme court took the position that "school officials should have sufficient immunity to enable them to act forthrightly." However, should an official act in such a manner as to constitute lack of good faith, he might be held for damages (Walden, 1975, p. 106).

After reviewing suspension related court decisions, Ackerly (1969) of the National Association of Secondary School Principals compiled the following suggested positions to be taken on ten issues:

1. Freedom of expression cannot legally be restricted unless its exercise interferes with the orderly conduct of classes and school work (p. 7).

    a. Buttons and other insignia may be worn to express a point of view unless doing so results in a direct interference with the school program.

    b. Buttons or other insignia may not be worn if the message is intended to mock, ridicule, or otherwise deliberately demean or provoke others because of race, religion, national origin, or individual views.

    c. No student may pass out buttons or other literature during regular school hours either in class or in the halls between classes.

    d. Students distributing buttons or other literature before or after regular school hours will be responsible for removing litter which may result from their activities.

    e. Failure to observe these rules can result in confiscation of the material, curtailment of the privilege or, when necessary, disciplinary action, including suspension (p. 8).

2. There should be no restriction on a student's hair style or his manner of dressing unless these present a "clear and present" danger to the student's health and safety, cause an interference with work, or create classroom or school disorder (p. 9).

3. The authority of school officials to comprehensively prescribe and control conduct in the schools has been affirmed repeatedly in the courts. The rules, however, must be concerned with speech or actions which disrupt the work of the school or the rights of other students. Therefore, rules regulating behavior in the school should reflect the school authorities obligation to respect the constitutional rights of students and to require a mature sense of responsibility on the part of students toward others and toward the school (p. 10).

4. A student's locker and desk should not be opened for inspection except when approved by the principal because he has reasonable cause to believe that prohibited articles are stored therein. If inspection takes place the student should be present (p. 11).

5. In regard to extracurricular activities:

    a. Before it can be recognized as a school group and be given use of school time and facilities, the club must be approved, in accordance with established criteria by the principal or some other designated school official.

b. Membership must be open to all students except where the purpose of the club requires qualifications (a French Club, for instance).

c. The club must have a faculty sponsor or adviser selected and approved according to agreed upon procedures, and club activities will not be permitted until a faculty sponsor has been selected.

d. Clearly improper purposes and activities are not permitted and if persisted in will be cause for withdrawing official approval of the group.

e. School groups, either continuing or ad hoc, are not permitted to use the school name in participating in public demonstrations or other activities outside the school unless prior permission has been granted by a designated school official (p. 13).

6. Rules governing school discipline should be established only after full participation of students and other concerned parties. In cases of suspension careful consideration should be given to procedural due process (p. 14).

7. In all cases the scope of the student government's powers, privileges, and responsibilities should be a matter of public record. A published charter or constitution is required. Activities performed within the approved charter should not be subject to veto by the principal or faculty (p. 16).

8. School sponsored press should be free from policy restrictions outside the normal rules for responsible journalism (p. 17).

9. Students should be allowed to present petitions to the administration at any time and without fear of recrimination (p. 18).

10. Students possessing or using drugs on school premises prohibited by law should be reported promptly to the appropriate law enforcement officials (p. 18).

The literature review relevant to the legal aspects of school suspensions provides information demonstrating the increasing concern of the courts to protect the constitutional rights of public school students. Contrary to previous years, decisions have shown increased support for students rather than school personnel in court cases resulting in an increased demand for procedural due process in school suspension cases.

SECTION B. TRENDS IN SCHOOL SUSPENSION

For the past twenty years since the Brown decision, schools across the country have been dealing with the issue of desegregation. Initially this decision was interpreted to mean simply that segregation could not legally be enforced, but gradually through court action desegregation has come to mean racially balanced schools with the goal that all children receive equal educational opportunity (Mayer, King, Borders-Patterson, and McCullough, 1974, pp. 7-8). This goal, however, seems to be threatened by new problems in desegregated schools, and one of the chief problems seems to be that of student suspension, (as indicated by several studies).

According to a 1974 report by the Children's Defense Fund (CDF), suspensions account for a large portion of the children who are out of school (p. 5). In addition to their own data, CDF analyzed data submitted by various schools to the Office for Civil Rights (OCR) and found "a nationwide pattern of suspensions from school that is shocking" (p. 123). They also found "the vast majority of suspensions occurring at the secondary level" (p. 126). In a prepared statement to those present at a hearing before the subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education of the U.S. House of Representatives in 1975, Marian Wright Edelman (Director of CDF) stated that CDF's study has found that there were at least two million children out of school in 1973, and that 11 percent of these children were out of school because of suspension or expulsion (p. 29).

CDF then did a follow-up report on suspensions entitled School Suspensions: Are They Helping Children (1975). CDF found that "in the 1972-73 school year, school districts with a little over half of the student population in this country suspended over one million children" (p. 9). Reports from 2,862 school districts revealed that those in 13 states suspended more than 5% of their students, while those in fifteen other states suspended more than 30,000 students. According to this study, the problem is not confined to any one type of school district or any one area of the country. Both rural and city districts experienced this problem, and states such as Idaho, New Jersey, and Louisiana are among those which reported proportionately high suspension rates. The problem was found to be most serious in the secondary schools.

There is further evidence of increased suspension rates presented in a report by a Student Concerns Project in Louisiana (1975) in which it is reported that during the 1973-74 school year suspensions peaked at 92,235. During the following school year 76,945 students were suspended, or 8.86% of the enrollment.

The Kentucky Chapter of the National Bar Association (Note 1) found that suspensions in the Louisville Independent School district and the Jefferson County Public Schools amounted to a combined total of 7,212 during the school year prior to desegregation (1974-75). After desegregation (and merger) in 1975-76, suspensions totalled 16,272, while during the first quarter of the following year (1976-77) there were 6,270 suspensions.

When Prince George's County in Maryland desegregated in 1973, there was an immediate "dramatic rise in the number of student suspensions" (USCCR, 1976, p. 387). During the first 3 months there were 5,128 suspensions, compared to 5,157 suspensions in the five months preceeding desegregation.

Hillsboro County, Florida desegregated during the 1971-72 school year. Suspensions in 1970-71 totalled 4,805, with increases to 8,598 in 1971-72, and 10,149 in 1972-73 (USCCR, 1976 b, p. 143).

There is some discussion in the literature relative to the impact of the desegregation process on student discipline which suggest that higher suspension rates occur at the time of implementation of desegregation plans.

In 1959 Herbert Wey and John Corey wrote a guidebook on desegregation entitled Action Patterns in School Desegregation, and although it was written almost 20 years ago, at least some of what they said then seems to be operative now.

> As a result of desegregation, discipline cases increase... A school relatively free of disciplinary problems before desegregation need not be too concerned about additional discipline problems afterward, but the school that is having problems will experience a definite increase after desegregation (p. 237).

A study by the American Friends Service Committee (1976) supports the implication that conditions in the school, and not desegregation itself, determine whether there will be a suspension problem. They found "that schools of approximately the same racial ratio, and the same 'type' of diverse student body have widely varying suspension rates" (p. 3). The CDF study of suspensions also found "a number of teachers and principals who did not resort to disciplinary exclusions and who ran their classes and schools well" ("Student Suspensions", 1972, p. 31).

It seems that although suspension rates in public schools have increased as desegregation has been implemented, this is not true in every case across the country; and suspension is not the problem of one particular area or type of school community. However, suspension rates have risen substantially and sufficient numbers of school children are being affected that suspension has recently become a subject for research. There is evidence that suspension is becoming an educational issue. There seems to be further evidence cited in the literature of the related disproportionate suspension of minority students.

Recent studies of suspension rates in public schools call attention to the resulting disproportionate suspension of minority students. A CDF study of suspension (1975) concluded that "while the largest number of suspended children are white, proportionately, suspensions hurt more children who are Black, poor, older, and male" (p. 9). In their analysis of data collected by the OCR covering the 1972-73 school year, they found that "29 states suspended over 5 percent of their total Black enrollment", while "only 4 states suspended 5 percent of their white students" (p. 63). There were 6 states in which at least 10% of the school's Black students were suspended, but in no state was the same rate of white students suspended. And in secondary schools this disproportionality is especially acute. "One in every eight Black children compared to one in every sixteen white children was suspended at least once during the 1972-73 school year" (p. 63).

The CDF's own survey of suspensions appears to agree with their analysis of OCR data. CDF found that "Black students ... were suspended more than three times as often as white students" (CDF, 1974, p. 130).

The same report quoted former OCR director Peter Holmes' statement to a house of representatives subcommittee concerning disproportionate minority suspensions. "In only one city of the twenty reviewed was the percentage of minorities suspended less than the percentage of minorities in the total enrollment ... suspensions or expulsion appears to weigh most heavily on the minority student" (p. 130). He cited as examples the cities of New York, Houston, Cleveland, Memphis, and Dallas. In a National Public Radio Broadcast in 1974, Mr. Holmes cited statistics from Mobile, Indianapolis, Pittsburgh, Prince Georges' County, Maryland, Boston, and Dade County, Florida, reinforcing the notion of disproportionate suspensions.

Shirley Boes Neill, in a publication on school suspensions (1976), reviewed the Southern Regional Council's (SCR) reports on students being "pushed out" of desegregated schools. After an analysis of SCR's report on expulsions, she concluded that minority students were expelled at twice the rate of non-minority students, and Black students were expelled at three times the rate of non-minority students" (p. 11).

In addition to the studies by CDF, OCR, and SCR, various other sources document disproportionate disciplinary actions. A 1971 study of minority expulsions by the National Educational Association (cited in NIE, Note 2) in 1,227 school districts (out of 2,831 surveyed), found evidence of disproportionate minority expulsions. A 1976 study by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights on Prince George's County, Maryland found that "not only did student suspensions increase following desegregation, but they also became more racially disproportionate" (p. 387). In the 1975 Student Concerns Project in Louisiana it was reported that in 1974-75, 59.14% of the total suspensions in Louisiana schools were suspensions of Blacks, even though Blacks constitute only 40% of the total student population. In another study of Orleans Parish Public School Systems in New Orleans (Clark, 1972), Blacks and males bore the brunt of suspension. The suspension rate in Dallas has risen steadily since 1968, and Blacks have been disproportionately suspended (Demarest and Jordan, 1975). Statistics from ten desegregated schools from the year 1971-1972 "indicate a total of 2,860 Black suspensions out of a Black student population of 2,842 as compared with 2,972 white student suspensions out of a total white student population of 16,433" (p. 28). While there already existed a disproportionate number of Black suspensions (Miller, 1975), Boston experienced an increase in Black suspensions after desegregation (USCCR, 1976 b, p. 20). In Florida similar problems have been experienced. A study by the Fifth Circuit Court revealed that a school district in Northern Florida suspended 185 of its 276 Black students and only 97 of its 710 white students during its first year of desegregation (cited in Mills, 1975). In Hillsboro County, Florida, although the total number of suspensions has been declining over the past few years, Black suspensions remain disproportionate (USCCR, 1976, p. 36). Stanford, Connecticut, Denver, Louisville, and Berkeley are among the cities which have reported similar problems (USCCR, 1976 b).

Not all schools which have desegregated have experienced disproportionate suspension rates of Black students. In the analysis of OCR data by the Children's Defense Fund, districts were found with racially proportionate suspension rates, and in some districts white suspension rates were higher than Black suspension rates (CDF, 1975, p. 67) CDF suggests that "If characteristics of Black children were ... responsible for high Black suspension rates, we would not find such districts where Blacks are not suspended disproportionately" (CDF, 1975, p. 70).

The goal of equal educational opportunity for all seems to have been threatened by suspension and expulsion practices, but there are other means of depriving students of their right to equal education.

Mark Yudof, in an article for Law and Contemporary Problems (1975) states that "legal and political efforts, first directed against system-wide segregation and finding inequalities, inevitably turned to what occurs within individual schools" (p. 382). He lists "ability grouping" and "special education" among other "targets for reform and litigation" (p. 382).

A 1976 report of the Commission on Civil Rights states that in desegregated schools "classes often are composed of students of one racial or ethnic group that vary considerably from the composition of the school" (1976 b, p. 129). The report gives as supporting evidence the findings of the Southern Regional Council Study of the South which "show that two of every three school districts have one or more schools with racially identifiable classrooms" (1976 b, p. 129). Ability grouping and special education classes are mentioned as causes of "classroom segregation".

Nicholaus Mills (1975), has written that besides suspensions, "special" schools, tracking, and unofficial exclusion of minorities from extracurricular activities are all ways of discriminating against Black students.

M. Hayes Mizell speaks of "barriers which will block the road to a quality education for Black and poor children", (pp. 11-12) and cites some examples of these barriers. He divides them into four categories which include:

a) curriculum practices, which include ability grouping and other measures which produce homogeneous classrooms;

b) financing, which involves unequal monies distributed among school districts;

c) exclusion of students, which involves suspension and expulsion practices, exclusion because of non-payment of fees, and other types of exclusion;

d) the low number of Black professionals in the educational system.

A recent (but undated) position paper by the Desegregation Studies Unit of the National Institute of Education discussed a variety of mechanisms, termed "resegregation" mechanisms, which are separating Black and white students. Among them were disproportionate suspensions and expulsions, "white flight", various "pushing out" mechanisms which affect both students and educators, tracking, grouping of classes, and the use of test scores to segregate.

The focus of this section has been directed toward highlighting the emerging importance of disciplinary actions as an educational issue.

There is an indication that suspension rates have increased in recent years and that Black students are being suspended at relatively higher rates than white students. In addition, other subtle exclusionary practices are used in some school districts.

The material reviewed briefly describes the scope of the problem, and does not elaborate on any of several significant factors. The following section is an examination of behaviors for which students are most frequently suspended.

SECTION C: TYPES OF OFFENSES

According to CDF's study, Children Out of School in America (1974), parents and children reported that most (63.4%) suspensions were for non-dangerous offenses (p. 120). Attendance problems (truancy and tardiness) accounted for 24.5% of reported suspensions. A total of 13.6% of reported suspensions were for what was termed "behavior problems", defined by a list of sometimes vague behavior such as "bad attitude" and "insubordination". Offenses related to verbal behavior accounted for 8.5%, 5.6% for smoking, and 4.1% for failing to comply with some type of punishment. Less than 3% of the students were suspended for what might be called serious or harmful offenses (drugs, vandalism, etc.), and 36.6% were suspended for fighting. Owen Kiernan, Executive Director of the National Association of Secondary

School Principals, objected to CDF's survey in part on the grounds that parents and children were the source of these reasons for suspensions and not school administrators (cited in Neill, 1976). NASSP conducted its own survey of 42 districts (or schools) and the schools' reports essentially agreed with what the parents and children reported. In order of frequency the lists of offenses included:

attendance problems
smoking
non-violent disruptive acts
violations of school rules (on buses and in cafeterias)
physical violence or threats
major offenses such as drugs and theft (Neill, 1976, p. 15).

In Richland County School District #1 for the years 1974-75 and 1975-76 short-term suspensions were studied and a similar pattern was found. In 1974-75 "cutting class" and "excessive tardies" accounted for 45% of the reported reasons for suspensions. In 1975-76 55% of the reported suspensions were for those same reasons (AFSC, 1976).

The Student Concerns Project report of Louisiana schools (Louisiana State Department of Education, 1975) states that according to 1974-75 suspension figures for 57 of 66 school districts, "more students were suspended for violations of attendance regulations than for any other reason" (p. 3). Of those suspensions a disproportionate number were Black.

Among the eleven school districts which participated in the Student Concerns Project, "absenteeism", which included such offenses as tardiness and class cutting, ranked at the top of the list of 20 major offenses. Fighting ranked second, and bodily injury to students and/or faculty ranked third.

In an analysis of reasons for indefinite suspensions of junior and senior high school students during the 1971-72 school session in the Orleans Parish Public Schools (Clarke, 1973), it was found that the largest number of students were suspended for "general failure to adapt to school, manifested by continued disobedience, refusal to do work, etc." (p. 32). The second largest number were suspended for "disrespect, insolence, impudence, using obscene language", and the third largest group were suspended for "disruption of class or other school activity" (p. 32). School attendance problems were the fourth largest category. Again, the largest numbers of students were suspended for non-dangerous offenses.

A study of ten schools in the Dallas Independent School District was used by plaintiffs in the *Hawkins* v. *Coleman* case (Demarest and Jordan, 1975). In examining disproportionate suspension rates of Blacks it was found that three-fifths of the Black suspensions were for such reasons as "insubordination", "refusing to follow directions", "refusing to be whipped", and "profanity" (p. 28).

In Prince George's County, Maryland, desegregation was implemented beginning January 29, 1973. During the 1972-73 school year, both before and after desegregation, school attendance-type problems accounted for more than one-third of the suspensions (USCCR, 1976 a, p. 388).

An analysis of reasons for suspensions in the Jefferson County Public Schools in Kentucky reported by the Kentucky Chapter of the National Bar Association (Note 1) shows that 41% of all school suspensions from September 1976 to February 1977 were for "excessive cuts" and "excessive tardies."

This section of the review has focused on an examination of the types of student behaviors which most frequently result in suspension. It is apparent that the majority of suspensions are for non-dangerous offenses, many of which appear to be vaguely defined, or for offenses which may be classified as class/school avoidance behavior. Relatively few suspensions are the result of behavior which is dangerous or criminal in nature.

SECTION D: ALTERNATIVES TO SUSPENSION

Suspensions have become a controversial discipline device. Parents and teachers question its effect upon the student's school achievement and also question the use of suspensions as a deterrent to misbehavior. Administrators, while in need of an effective discipline tool, must deal with loss of state funds when pupils are suspended from school.

Adding to the existing problems of suspension has been Supreme Court intervention in suspension cases. In Goss v. Lopez, the Supreme Court ruled that students cannot be suspended from school without the minimum due process of a rudimentary hearing. An informal hearing is required after which a suspension decision can be made (Thomas, 1976, p. 15). Donald Thomas (1976), Superintendent of Schools for Salt Lake City School District, Utah, predicts that, because of Goss v. Lopez, schools will be weakened in the eyes of parents and that each suspension will have the possibility of becoming a major conflict (p. 16).

Added to the above problems of suspensions, is the increasing concern for high rates of suspension in schools. Of equal concern is the disproportionate rates of suspensions for Black students in desegregated school systems. These factors have culminated in expressed needs for discipline alternatives or alternatives to suspension.

Kittle and Meares (1976) identified two alternatives open to the administration: "either allow the disruptive student to remain in the classroom, where the rights of his fellow students to an education are impaired by his misconduct, or arrange for a formal hearing (until which time the student must remain in class), with the possibility that the student might be possibly returned to class" (p. 60).

Based on experiences as employees of the Fisher Campus of Urbana (Illinois) Junior High School, Kittle and Meares see the in-school suspension room as alleviating weaknesses of the traditional disciplinary system. The described weaknesses include missed classwork, increased community problems when children are unsupervised due to suspension, misinterpretation by the student of suspension as a reward, student alienation and the "labeling" school conduct record (p. 61).

The in-school suspension room provides an experienced certified teacher and offers alternatives to those involved including the student, teacher, and administrator. These alternatives include continuation of classwork, continued supervision of the student, and the ability to "suspend" a student from the class in which he is experiencing difficulty rather than from his entire schedule of classes (p. 61). In addition, formal suspension procedures are avoided with the school continuing to receive state funds available to schools for individual students actually in school (p. 62). Kittle and Meares do stipulate that regular suspension procedures are maintained for those students who cannot work in the suspension room atmosphere (p. 62).

Minneapolis uses in-school suspension or I.S.S. in four schools. Sent to I.S.S. for 'severe behavior', which includes using drugs or alcohol or repeated truancy, students remain there for two to five days. While class assignments must be completed, students are not allowed to participate in extra-curricular school activities (O'Brian, 1976, p. 35).

A major purpose of the I.S.S. program developed by Jim Goluska is to teach students to accept the consequences of their actions and to make them think about what they are doing. In addition to exclusion from school extra-curricular activities, students are required to complete increased school assignments. Assignments are based on individual ability. I.S.S. students are also assigned 500 word essays such as "Where Am I Going, and How Am I Getting There" (p. 36).

Some doubts are expressed about the I.S.S. program. A counselor says: 'The program is only as good as the guy running it. Put a dictator in one of those programs and you'd really have a mess' (p. 37).

An additional problem was expressed by an inner-city school assistant principal: 'A program like that--cooping kids up, cutting off their outside activities--would never work at our school. That could turn off some marginal students forever' (p. 37). However, Goluska feels I.S.S. is having positive effects with drug usage decreasing and only 23 I.S.S. repeaters of 173 for last year (p. 36).

The "In-Building Suspension" program is used by Evansville, Indiana Central High School. With the objective of providing success for the student, activities in self-awareness and self-concept development are provided in addition to the student's educational program (Alternatives to Suspension, 1977, p. 1).

Another variation of the in-school suspension room is the "Educational Adjustment Center" used by Sedalia, Missouri schools. This program provides students an opportunity to complete classwork with additional counseling. Special aid in reading is given to those students with reading problems (Alternatives to Suspension, 1977, p. 7).

Dayton, Ohio employs "SHOP" in Roosevelt High School as an in-school suspension room. "SHOP" consists of a "Crisis" room and a "Sharing and Caring" room. Students referred to "SHOP" are evaluated in terms of academic and affective needs with individual programs determined accordingly (Alternatives to Suspension, 1977, p. 8).

A 1975 report developed by the Task Force on Suspension and Expulsions of the Louisiana State Department concluded that in-school suspension rooms were being used in a number of Louisiana school systems (Report on the Task Force, 1975).

In-school suspension rooms, also referred to as "time-out" rooms, are not always looked upon as positive discipline approaches as suggested by a recent collection of articles which appeared in the Louisville Courier-Journal, on the use of "time-out" rooms in Jefferson County, Kentucky schools. Referred to by school officials as 'time-out' rooms or 'holding' rooms and by students as the 'tanks' or 'Siberia', actual policies for students in the rooms seemed to vary. Practices ranged from students being required to complete coursework, to not allowing students to do anything except sitting erect and idle during each of the days assigned to the room.

The following is an example of rules to be followed by students in one suspension room in Jefferson County:

> 'Do not sleep or put your head down.'
> 'Never get out of your seat without permission.'
> 'Restroom breaks mid-morning and mid-afternoon.
> You will be escorted to the restroom' (Johnson, April 14, 1977).

Most students are sent to the rooms for cutting class, being late to school or class, disrupting class, or smoking in unassigned areas. Students who commit such offenses as assault on teachers, alcohol and drug use, extortion or refusal to behave in the time out room are suspended (Nichols, April 14, 1977).

Concern was expressed by one unnamed teacher assigned to monitor a time-out room who said, "I just think it's a waste of the taxpayers' money to pay a teacher $12,000 a year to sit and monitor kids. I'm not a warden. I'd rather be teaching kids..." The teacher also suggested students assigned writing exercises were doing 'nothing constructive' (Nichols, April 14, 1977). Mixed reactions of school administrators regarding the effectiveness of the time-out rooms were evident in the reported interviews.

As suggested in the programs mentioned, counseling is seen as an important part of most programs dealing with the potentially suspendable student. Various approaches to counseling students are used. In Mesa, Arizona, TALK--Teachers Available to Listen to Kids, provides an opportunity for discussion of student problems and needs between students, counselors, and teachers.

G.G.I.--Guided Group Interaction, implemented by Michigan Social Services employs peer pressure as a technique in counseling students. The leader of the peer group acts as the "teacher" guiding the group in discussions of individual problems and needs (Neill, 1977).

P.A.S.S.--Positive Alternatives to Student Suspensions is a federally funded program aimed at developing communication skills of parents, students, and teachers. A "time-out" room with a facilitative listener is available to students. Individual and group consultation sessions with a social worker and school psychologist are also made available to students and teachers. Such consultations deal with values clarification, reality therapy, and transactional analysis. Special counseling in communication skills is also available to parents (Alternatives to Suspension, 1977, p. 72).

Fremont, California uses a conference call approach in which concerned parties including the teacher, administrator, and counselor can talk simultaneously with the parent concerning a students' immediate needs (Neill, 1977).

As a result of their study on discipline, the Sacramento City Unified School District devised the "Guidance Clinic" staffed with a guidance counselor, counselor-aide, secretary, and half-time psychologist. Students are referred to the Clinic as a preventive measure or when other corrective measures have failed. Referrals may be for "short term" periods or "long term" periods. Behavior modification programs are designed for the student who may remain in the Clinic up to ten days (Stiavelli, 1972, p. 64).

Behavior modification or contingency-management is being used in different formats in several programs. At El Camino High School in Mirada, California, students collect "tickets" as rewards for appropriate behavior. These tickets are used much like raffle tickets in drawing for prizes. In addition, free time is also as a reward (Neill, 1977).

The Malcolm Price Laboratory School at the University of Northern Iowa conducted an eight-week experimental classroom with ten intermediate grade boys having histories of 'disruptive' behavior. Contingency-management techniques were used in controlling undesirable behaviors. The classroom was divided into a work area and a free time area with students earning check marks for completing assignments in the work area. A given number of these check marks could be used as "tickets" to the free time area which contained games, puzzles, records, etc. Teachers found that material reinforcement was not needed after a given period of time, depending on the student, and that accomplishment became a reward in itself (Discipline in the Classroom, 1975, p. 70).

Behavior contracts are employed by Englewood, New Jersey schools. The principal and assistant principal meet with the student who signs a notarized behavior contract. The contract is of a standard form, is effective, takes little time, and no special funding (School Suspensions: Are They Helping Children? 1975, Chapter 6).

Work-Study programs are being advocated by some districts. The Chicago school district is supporting a program designed to combine school work with vocational training. Students spend half of their days in academic courses and half working on projects funded by companies in Chicago for which students are paid an hourly wage. School officials report increased academic and vocational skills with attendance also greatly improved.

St. Paul (Minnesota) has a similar program with two special Career Study Centers. While originally intended to reintegrate students into regular schools, a majority of students stayed in the Centers until diplomas were received (O'Brian, 1976, p. 37).

Orange County, California has found a Saturday Work-Study Program a successful discipline device. Assigned suspension hours are used by students on Saturdays to work on the school grounds under the supervision of school personnel (Neill, 1977).

Based upon his experiences as Assistant Principal of La Palma Junior High School in Buena Park, California, Bettker (1976) strongly advocates the work study program. Students work at gardening, landscaping, custodial chores, clerical jobs, and assisting teachers after school. Prescriptive counseling contracts were used with students. The total number of suspensions was reduced by over 90% from the previous year. The repeat factor of students serving on the work study program was only 19% (1976, p. 26).

Alschuler and Shea (1974) introduced an alternative known as "Social Literacy Training" in which teachers and students learn to recognize the "moves" and "cycles" in the "attention-discipline game" providing a way of approaching a solution to the problem. Seeing discipline problems as resulting from a breakdown in student/teacher relationships, Social Literacy Training identifies as objectives: learning to analyze classroom discipline cycles and learning to transform discipline cycles into the discipline of learning with negotiated changes in relationship rules (p. 80).

Recognizing the importance of parental involvement, many school districts have initiated programs designed to enhance parental involvement. In Lincoln, Nebraska a 'Parent-a-Week' call stipulates that each teacher will call at least one parent each week relating positive comments about the student. Administrators and teachers are enhancing their images within the community and promoting educational goals (What Schools Are Doing, 1974, p. 47).

Parents may also become involved actively as members of the Parent Teacher Association or similar groups. Activities have included parent calls to homes of absent students, a wake-up service for students whose parents work, arranging transportation for students, and liaison services with police concerning arrested students (Neill, 1977).

Used in a junior high school in New York, the "student ombudsman" serves as a student advocate and mediator between students and teachers. Funds to support this position are obtained from district sources with additional personnel hired with money for federal drug programs. Other schools in New York State have hired secondary school students from the Neighborhood Youth Corps program to serve as student ombudsmen. Student workers give assistance and information regarding student rights and responsibilities to fellow students in city schools. Student workers are trained and aided by adult staff members (School Suspensions: Are They Helping Children, 1975, Chapter 6).

Also utilizing the peer group interaction approach is the "review board" implemented by the Key West (Florida) High School. Procedures of the Disciplinary Review Board closely resemble courtroom procedures. The DRB was created to provide a review forum for students who feel they have been unfairly disciplined. The student (plaintiff) selects a teacher as defense counselor. Members of the Review board include three students and three teachers who have been chosen at random. The

Board has the power to uphold or overturn the student's punishment, however, proceedings are taped to provide evidence to the county school board should the parents or student be dissatisfied with the trial outcome and wish to appeal. According to Thomas Roberts, Dean of Boys at Key West High, the DRB has been effective in eliminating mass disturbances and individual discipline problems (What Schools Are Doing, 1974, p. 46).

Many programs such as Project ORDER (Organization for Responsibility, Dependability, Education and Reality) employ a combination of techniques in solving suspension problems. Project ORDER's general aim is to overcome adverse effects of minority group isolation. Funded under the Emergency School Aid Act, Project ORDER is located in an inner-city middle school. Specific objectives include "improving general school atmosphere as perceived by faculty, students and parents, improving pupil behavior, and improving the teaching/learning environment so that effective objectives can be achieved eventually contributing to greater cognitive gain" (Sanders and Yarbrough, 1976, p. 333).

Project ORDER has combined the use of transactional analysis, reality therapy, individually guided education, and a crisis intervention center for students with severe behavior problems. Administrators cite faulty curriculum as the cause for much alienation and misbehavior. Discipline problems with Project ORDER students are down 63% and suspensions down 20% (Sanders and Yarbrough, p. 334).

Thomas (1976) has identified an alternative to suspension prompted by recent court actions in school suspension cases and dealing with law instruction for both parents and students. Law related education differs from civics classes in that students learn to live the law through simulated trials and in dealing with everyday problems versus reading about good citizenship. Much of the curriculum is built around actual court cases with students learning about the legal issues involved in consumer affairs, marriage, crime, traffic violations, and basic freedoms (p. 17). With law-related education, Thomas hopes students use their knowledge of the law to solve problems rather than resorting to anger and violence (p. 19).

Programs presented have maintained the student as a member of the "regular" school setting. There are, however, a number of alternative schools in existence. These alternative schools may be for the gifted student providing experiences beyond the "traditional" academic program or, as in the Salt Lake City Granite Alternative, they may be designed for students who cannot cope behaviorally in the traditional school setting. Problems may include poor self-esteem, drug involvement, and conflict with authority. Curricula are individualized with improvement of the student's self concept and image viewed as major goals. Additional support services are utilized including a social worker, school psychologist, and district juvenile court liaison person.

New Berlin, Wisconsin utilizes an alternative school called HELP--Handling Educational and Learning Problems. Designed for the student who is a potential drop-out, behaviorally disruptive or a slow learner, the program has two major objectives: providing basic education in math, science, social studies, and English, and encouraging socially acceptable behaviors by providing opportunities for self-improvement and self-respect. Referred by counselors, teachers, parents or through self-referral, students at HELP have shown improved behaviors and greater rapport with teachers (Alternatives to Suspension, p. 11).

This review has identified samples of the increasing numbers and diversity of alternatives to suspension. These alternatives seem, however, to be developed with one of two distinct purposes in mind--strictly as punishment or as a means of identifying and coping with critical incidents that precipitate undesirable student behaviors. The latter, utilizing counseling and stressing increased communication skills, would seem to be more beneficial to the student and the school community on a long-term basis.

SECTION E: TEACHERS AND STUDENTS IN THE DESEGREGATED SETTING

The teacher is clearly recognized as the central figure in the classroom; the teacher is responsible for establishing a climate that is conducive to learning, one that is responsive to the needs of the individual learner, and a climate that encourages and facilitates the total development of pupils. All of this should be orchestrated in an environment that is relatively free from elements that can detract from the learning process. The role of the classroom teacher in a desegregated setting becomes more complex in that often (s)he must establish such a classroom environment in spite of a conglomeration of negative factors associated with school desegregation.

The pre-existing attitude regarding desegregation that teachers bring to school can have significant impact on the climate that is ultimately established within the classroom. Such attitudes, if viewed negatively by pupils, may impede the accomplishment of specific learning tasks, activities, and goals. Green (1975) indicates that children from low socio-economic or urban communities are often confronted in the classroom by teachers who view them as intellectually deprived and unlikely to succeed. These initial attitudes could well determine the kinds of activities that are undertaken in the classroom and further hamper the development of positive student-teacher relations.

Ayers (1970) suggests that attitudes are generally derived from actual experiences and encounters. In the absence of firsthand experiences there is a tendency to take on feelings of the dominant society toward racially and culturally different groups.

Strom (1966, p. 73) refers to the hazard of individuals developing an emotional logic which has as a focal point the sorting of people based on socio-economic status and related criteria, and then seeking only new information which confirms previous beliefs. When school desegregation is accompanied by community unrest, disruption, violence, and other negative protestations, the occurrence of such attitudes and predispositions are likely to be present. Teacher opinion of students and expectations for them may in fact affect subsequent student behaviors and achievement outcomes as described by Rosenthal and Jacobsen (1968). The importance of developing positive attitudes toward minority children is underscored by a number of educators (Niemeyer, 1966; Noar, 1974; Clark, 1965). It is recognized that such a process is critical for teachers who are to work in desegregated schools.

The problem associated with teaching in desegregated schools is further exacerbated when other factors such as middle class values and attitudes are considered. Much criticism has been directed toward the inability of middle class teachers to relate in a positive manner to minority students. Brophy (1974, p. 9) reporting on a study conducted by Rubovitz and Maehr described the results of an experimental micro teaching situation which involved 66 white female undergraduate prospective elementary teachers. "Each taught a lesson to a group of four racially mixed seventh or eighth grade students. On six of the eight measures of teacher-child interaction used, significant difference based on races was found." The teachers gave less attention to Black students; they encouraged Blacks to continue with an idea less frequently; they ignored a greater percentage of statements made by Black students; and they praised Black students less frequently and

40

criticized them more. It has been found that teachers with positive attitudes toward integration had fewer discipline problems and required fewer discipline measures in their classrooms than teachers with negative attitudes (Paretti, 1975).

The following studies suggest that speech styles or visual cues may also be a factor operative in the process of teacher perception and evaluation of students.

Woodward and Salzer (1973) asked a sample of elementary teachers to rate the content of taped reports, read by students. The reports were identical in content, but they were read by two different children. These authors report that teachers rated the recordings of the Black child significantly lower on seven of the ten rating measures used. Such an outcome may result from negative teacher attitudes toward the Black versus the Euro-American child's speech, even though both children read the same report exactly as written. Because of the limited speaker sample used in this study, definitive conclusions are not warranted, but the authors imply that the teachers' evaluations of the report reflected teacher attitudes toward Black versus Euro-American children's speech rather than the content of the report which was the same for both children.

In another study to determine the effect of visual cues upon teacher reaction to speech samples, the speech of one child was actually dubbed for another. Williams, Whitehead, and Miller (1971) asked a sample of undergraduate education majors to view three ninety-second segments of videotape showing fifth and sixth grade Black, Mexican-American, and Euro-American boys speaking. What is described as Euro-American English was dubbed in as the speech for the three boys. The perspective educators were asked to rate the speech of each boy according to the factors of "confidence - eagerness" and "ethnicity-nonstandard".* Black and Mexican-American boys shown with audio dubs of Euro-American English were judged to be significantly more "ethnic - nonstandard" than the Euro-American children speaking Euro-American English.

In a report edited by Johnson (1973) for the Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, Dorothy Clement cites (pp. 224-35) studies which indicate that institutional adjustment, or conformity to school rules and values, is an important factor in the formulation of teacher judgements.

A project report by Goulder (1971) stated that:

> The teachers' selection (for ability groupings) were not made on the basis of formal testing. We believe that the teachers based their decisions on a number of behavioral traits which they assumed to be predictive of "success." While we are not able to precisely identify all of these traits they appear to fall into three categories: (1) those indicating that the child, according to the teacher, is "teachable" or can learn, such as verbal skills and following directions; (2) those indicating that the child can adapt to bureaucratic school norms, such as being quiet, disciplined, neat and orderly; and (3) those indicating that the child might achieve middle-class goals, particularly those related to upward mobility, such as being from economically "better" homes, being submissive and polite and being able to defer gratifications (Goulder, 1971: 6).

Clements (p. 234) also cites Feshback's 1969 study which concluded that:

> The results provide striking support for the hypothesis that student teachers prefer pupils whose behavior reflects rigidity, conformity, and orderliness or dependency, passivity, and acquiescence more than pupils whose behavior is indicative of flexibility, non-conformity, and untideness or independence, activity, and assertiveness (Feshback, 1969: 82).

---

*For a discussion of the development and definition of these factors see Williams, 1970; Williams, Whitehead, and Troupmann, 1970.

Students who are new to particular school settings and students who experience a change in style and organization of the educational setting are likely to be perceived as maladjusted or disrespectful of the norms and expectations of the school; when, in fact, such students may have little or no knowledge regarding the new rules and expectations.

Faulk (1972) cites the teachers' lack of understanding of the students as a primary causal factor in most problems which occur in desegregated schools. He sees teacher attitudes as being "most critical", and attributes teacher lack of contact with Blacks as a cause of problems and misunderstandings between teachers and Black students.

Several other writers consider it to be essential to successful classroom interaction that teachers endeavor to understand their students (Noar, 1974; Shinn, 1971; Fuchs, 1969). Black and white teachers seem to view the problem of understanding differently. When a group of white teachers in a southern state were asked about their apprehensions toward Black students, their answers reflected concerns relative to lack of understanding:

1. Lack of common grounds for understanding different styles, different values.
2. Understanding language, dialect; communication.
3. Overcoming their prejudices.
4. Planning for individual differences.
5. Lack of respect for adults.
6. Understanding their lack of interest.
7. Poor training of Black students before integration.
8. Lack of training in the home.
9. Negro children downgrading themselves.

10. Fear of being prejudiced against them.
11. Defensiveness among students.
12. Profanity--vulgarity.
13. Lack of confidence in handling strictly racial problems.
14. Parental apathy.

When the Black teachers were asked about their apprehensions toward white pupils, their responses centered around a concern for achieving true integration:

1. Trying to get the students to mix--getting them to be a whole class instead of separating themselves.
2. Helping some white children get rid of their feelings of superiority.
3. Getting them to feel they are a part of the class.
4. White parents are overly protective.
5. Trying to promote a feeling of a more relaxed atmosphere between the races (Buxton, Prichard, Bingham, Jackson, and Talps, 1974, p. 21 & 22).

Kron and Faber (1973) discuss a reaction which may be common among inexperienced teachers or teachers who have been transferred to schools of a different "sub-culture" than the one with which they are familiar. This reaction, which is termed "culture shock", is manifested by a number of symptoms, including "hysteria, weeping, (a) state of near collapse, depression, self-doubt, hostility ... fatigue, anger against strangers confronting one ... a fernzied retreat into the familiar ... (and) often, in addition, a feeling of helplessness and a desire for company for one's own kind" (Arensberg and Niehoff, as cited by Fuchs, 1969, 1. 21). Kron and Faber suggest that culture shock is common among teachers who have been transferred. The fact that individual teachers experience differing degrees of the malady suggests that some have more tolerance for unfamiliar situations, and, for a number of reasons, can adjust with less difficulty (Fuchs, 1969, p. 21).

A similar teacher reaction can be seen in desegregated classrooms. A white teacher from Indianapolis reported having feelings of "resentment" and "inadequacy" when her classroom was integrated (Giles, 1959, p. 74). Reports of teachers crying in their principal's offices are not uncommon (Orfield, 1976).

The sense of inadequacy felt by the teacher is further documented by Orfield (1976). He reports that often teachers face a "professional crisis" with the realization that they are not effective with children from backgrounds with which they are unfamiliar. He says that "when these 'good' teachers are confronted with large numbers of students who do not respond in the school's 'typical' way, they must either blame the newcomers or recognize and acknowledge a very serious professional inadequacy" (p. 318).

Lack of teacher acceptance of individual differences is evident in the existence of a status hierarchy among teachers which dictates that a teacher's status is determined by the type of student (and subject) which (s)he teaches (Vredevoe, 1967). Therefore, students of lower academic levels may indeed be resented by their teachers, and this condition could be a source of conflict within the student-teacher relationship. Orfield (1976) discusses a case study by Metz of three California schools which found that older teachers from schools that had been considered "high status" schools prior to desegregation seemed to have the greatest degree of difficulty in adjusting to desegregation. They expressed hostility over their perception that their "comfortable school (had been) invaded by strange children with no respect for their ideas of what a classroom should be like" (Metz, as cited in Orfield, 1976, p. 319).

A lack of understanding and regard might be accepted by some students (Becker, 1952, p. 460), but certainly not be all (Green and Brydon, 1975, p. 111). Some writers consider student rebellion to be a healthy reaction to a rigid system (Green and Brydon, 1975, p. 111).

> Thinking active minds often question a teachers opinion or occasionally forget a boring homework assignment. Students sometimes wear clothing or hairstyles which conflict with rigid dress codes. Teachers frequently interpret such behavior as disrespectful or insubordinate. Rather than looking to the system for the root of the problem, the teacher finds fault with the students. Studies have shown that an increasing number of young people are being suspended for such behavior and the majority of suspended students are Black (p. 111).

It appears that the transition from segregated to desegregated classrooms is not a smooth one for many teachers. Teachers who were once considered to be effective and competent in their racially homogeneous classrooms experience self-doubt and confusion when placed in racially mixed classrooms (Orfield, 1976).

In support of the idea that Black and white teachers see the problem differently and that white teachers tend to blame discipline problems on lack of understanding between the races is the report of a study by Wynn (1971) in which it was found that more than half the white teachers blamed their discipline problems on communication, whereas Black teachers did not. It was also found that more white than Black teachers admitted to "experiencing discipline problems with students of the opposite race" (p. 16).

Further evidence of white teachers having more discipline problems than Black teachers in desegregated schools is offered by Braxton and Bullock (1972) in a study of two rural schools in Georgia, in which it was found that of six Black and twelve white high school teachers interviewed, none of the Black teachers reported an increase in discipline problems, whereas eight of the twelve white teachers reported an increase. The authors speculated that perhaps "southern white teachers having lived near Blacks all of their lives without understanding them may have been quick to condemn and judge as unruly Blacks' behavior which was accepted as normal by Black teachers" (p. 45). Gottlieb (1964) also found that when white and Black teachers choose from a list of objectives which describe Black students, the Black teachers appeared to be "less critical and less pessimistic in their evaluations of these students than the white" (p. 353).

One apprehension which many teachers have relative to classroom discipline is that of losing control of the students (Niemeyer, 1966, p. 14; Becker, 1952, p. 457). The point at which the students are considered to be "out of control" is defined by the teacher, and the student who goes beyond the arbitrarily determined point of control may be considered a "discipline problem" (Becker, 1952, p. 457). There appears to be some disagreement among teachers, as well as between students and teachers, as to what behaviors are considered to be serious problems (Rajpal, 1972; Mutimer, and Rosemier, 1967). Using a list which was developed by E.K. Wickman and administered to teachers and mental hygienists in 1928, Rajpal (1972) had 100 teachers and 20 school psychologists rate the degree of seriousness of 50 student behaviors on a seven point scale, Multimer and Rosemier used the same instrument and administered it to 40 teachers and 911 students in 1967. Among the top ten offenses which were listed as being most serious, the 1967 and 1972 groups of teachers agreed on stealing, destruction of school property, lying, cheating, cruelty and bullying, unreliableness, and being easily discouraged; but they disagreed on such behaviors as being unhappy, truancy, being unsocial, disobedience, obscene notes/ talk, and impertinence. It might be concluded that the behaviors in the first group are for the most part offenses which are widely recognized as being socially deviant, whereas the offenses in the second group appear to be more a matter of personal preference or judgement.

A study conducted by Robert Stebbins (1970) sought to obtain information on teacher definitions of disorderly conduct. Stebbins found that, for teachers included in the study, reaction to disruption was based not only on consideration of the behavior, but upon "some identification of the students involved in terms of the level of their past academic performance and deportment" (Stebbins, 1970: 223). Because the teacher's evaluation of and reaction to various behaviors is dependent, in part, upon the classroom activity, the teacher's academic success expectations of the student, and the teacher's behavioral expectations of the student, the same type of behavior may be evaluated differently and receive different responses.

While differential evaluation of and responses to student behavior may occur for the same behavior, the possibility for misinterpretation of behavior enhances the probability of certain students receiving negative teacher evaluations and reactions. Rosenfeld (1971) describes problem situations arising from cultural differences and conflicts between the student/home and teacher/school cultures. Rosenfeld suggests that student movement in the classroom may be related to the home inspired orientation to space. Lower-class students who live in relatively smaller environments may indeed feel isolated when confined to a desk which is to remain separated from the other desks in the classroom.

Ramirez and Taylor (1967) conducted a rather systematic study. These authors found that those students who were rated low on adjustment (as indicated by information in the cumulative files) were also most closely identified with Mexican-American values.

The process of learning to cope and perhaps change attitudes among teachers has been and continues to be a slow one. Justin (1972) reported on an attitude questionnaire administered to teachers in Palm Beach, Florida, who were being transferred to other schools as a means of achieving racial balance. He concluded that although some were making efforts to support meaningful integration, "racial prejudice is very much alive in the minds of hundreds of school teachers" (p. 92). Grossman, Clark, Lowenherz, and Pugh (1971) report on an attempt to promote mutual understanding between children from urban classrooms and student teachers by having them meet weekly, followed by open discussion meetings among student teachers and a clinic staff member. The result was that the group discussions "revealed that students possess little respect for anybody who is obviously poor, in need of help; or worst of all, is getting help through public funds" (p. 490). The writers concluded that if future teachers hold the type of beliefs and feelings regarding some children which were exposed in the discussion groups, "there is cause to wonder how even our good teachers can be effective when their heads are trying to help while their guts are tied into knots of anger, disgust, and resentment" (p. 490).

Students somehow sense how their teachers view them, as was seen in a report by the Commission on Civil Rights (undated): "Students respond well when they ... are liked and respected by the teachers. Racist views or middle class contempt for lower socio-economic groups almost absolutely obstruct communication and destroy the chances for effective teaching" (p. 8).

Although teacher attitudes are vital to successful classroom interaction, it would be simplistic to say that teacher attitudes are the only factor. The student is also a factor in the student-teacher relationship.

The quality of the student-teacher relationship and inherent student performance are affected by the expectations which students hold upon entering the desegregated school. The literature reveals significant amounts of skepticism by both Black and white students regarding desegregation. Sikes (1975) states that "many Black parents and students feel they are paying a penality assessed for the desegregation of schools" (p. 116). Furthermore, most Black students feel:

1. Theirs are the schools to be closed;
2. They are the one's who suffer the greatest loss of leadership opportunity as a result of transition;
3. They are the ones most likely to be bused (and for longer distances);
4. They are the ones exposed to a strange environment with its high possibility of offering only a hostile and demeaning climate;
5. They are the ones most likely to face Black teachers who will (to them) sacrifice integrity to be accepted by their white colleagues, thereby, joining in an adversary position rather than one of advocacy, and
6. They will be seen as generally "dumb" or at least being socially and educationally inferior to their white peers (p. 116).

Sikes (1976) further indicates that similar feelings are held by white students who are bused to traditionally Black schools, but because of the intensity of white resistance to busing, the Black student perceives a "deep-seated hatred of Blacks by whites." This precipitates a resentment in Black students which, when accompanied by feelings of helplessness, may lead to acts of violence or misconduct by students who are "basically quiet, reserved, law-abiding citizens" (p. 116).

As mentioned, Black students are subject to the attitudes and prejudices of teachers. However, complaints made by Black students to administrators are often futile. Added to the anger and frustration which the student feels may be the lack of support by the Black parent who fears retaliation by the teacher or administrator (Sikes, 1976, p. 118), or who may be too intimidated by the school to even complain.

Black and white student relationships may vary. White students reaching out to Black students may encounter a certain protectiveness on the part of the Black student--a protectiveness learned through previous experiences. Many Black students use the philosophy "a good offense is the best defense." This offense may include "loudness, bravado, picking fights, threats, extortion, and other kinds of 'I'll-get-you-first' psychology." Although disciplinary action may be necessary, it is only a temporary curtailment and not a cure (Sikes, 1976, p. 118).

A cause of student conflict was cited by a Morningside High School teacher in the Ingelwood, California school desegregation study which dealt with powerlessness felt by the Black student in the desegregated setting. The teacher stated that "Black students do not want to be a minority of 10 percent in a school as they are in a nation." Reasons given dealt with the inadequacy of their numbers in school elections and decisions and accompanying frustrations (Bonacich and Goodman, 1972, p. 39).

Powerlessness of the Black student is increased by feelings of helplessness in dealing with school authority figures as mentioned by Sykes (1976). Counselors, supposedly seen as supportive to students, are included as authority figures. In studying Black and white attitudes toward white counselors, Burrell (1971) cited Phillips who characterized white counselor-Black counselor relationships as ineffective due to "deep feelings of mutual distrust." Burrell also cited Green who stated: "with a special knowledge of needs of the Negro gained by studying his psychological and sociological background, a sensitive and sympathetic white counselor can structure an atmosphere that will allow the Black student to express himself freely" (p. 48).

Concluding, Black students may react behaviorally to factors related to desegregation including powerlessness in dealing with school authority figures, alienation in a new setting, feelings of resentment due to past and current experiences with racial prejudice and failure to find supportive school related individuals.

The teacher plays a crucial role in providing for the academic and social success of the student in the desegregated school setting. Factors which determine the success of the teacher include the abilities to curtail personal prejudices, understand and accept cultural differences, and express a sensitivity toward the needs of all students.

The teacher who experiences difficulty in dealing with the desegregated classroom setting because of racial prejudice or personal rigidity provides an atmosphere conducive to disruptive behavior and disrespect on the part of the students.

The students' attitudes toward administrators, teachers, classmates, and the desegregation process in general also play an important role in the quality of the desegregated classroom environment.

The teacher-student relationship is perhaps the most important aspect of the successfully desegregated school program. Attitudes of racial prejudice on the part of teachers and students, failure or refusal of school personnel to recognize curricular needs of students, and disregard for the insecurities prompted by the desegregation process contribute to nagative behavior responses, and a school setting that is non-conducive to learning.

SECTION II

Methodology

METHODOLOGY

Project Design and Procedures

Project Student Concerns operates in two phases. Phase I focuses on data collection and analysis activities designed to identify probable causes for the disproportionate numbers of Black student suspensions. Phase II will test the effectiveness of four different interventions, directed toward the reduction of disproportionate suspensions of Black students. The following work plan was developed to structure staff activities essential to the completion of Phase I.

1.0 Question

1.01 Are there student characteristics or combinations of characteristics that are most often present among those students who are suspended?

1.02 Do attributes of ethnicity contribute to the disproportionate suspension rates for any ethnic group of students?

1.03 Is there any indication of unequal application of discipline to students of any ethnic group?

1.1 Objectives

1.11 To determine if there are students with certain characteristics who are being suspended in disproportionate numbers.

1.12 To determine those secondary schools that are suspending disproportionate numbers of students with certain characteristics.

1.13 To submit a preliminary report to the school district, including an analysis of rate and proportions of suspensions, and recommendations for interventions.

1.2 Strategy

1.21 A. Collect and analyze LEA suspension data by ethnicity, gender, type of offenses, and grade level for all high schools.

1.21 B. Determine if significant differences between expected and actual suspensions by school by various combinations of student characteristics exist.

1.22 Identify those schools that have disproportionate suspension rates, according to student characteristics.

1.23 Provide a narrative of the extent and nature of suspensions for the first quarter of school year 1976-77.

1.3 Tasks

1.31 a) Determine what data are needed to answer the research question.

b) Determine the data sources and secure approval from persons who control data.

c) Determine method of data collection and summary.

d) Determine appropriate statistical treatment for data analysis.

e) Arrange for data processing services.

f) Establish a statistical mean for disproportionate suspension.

1.32 Test for significance by school suspension by various combinations of student characteristics.

1.33 Prepare a preliminary report for LEA with findings of study and recommendations for remedial action.

1.4 Population

1.41 Suspended high school students in Jefferson County.

1.42 25 high schools in Jefferson County.

1.43 High schools with disproportionate suspension rates, above the district mean.

1.5 Instrumentation

1.51 Data coding forms.

1.6 Data Collection

1.61 A student suspension file will be assembled to include the following data items:

a) Date of offense.
b) Race/sex code.
c) School location code.
d) Violation code.
e) Length code.
f) Jurisdiction code.
g) Previously suspended.
h) Grade level.
i) Age - birth date.
j) Home school.

1.62 Enrollment data by school, eth-sex, and grade level.

1.63 Same as 1.61 - 1.62.

1.7 Sources of Data

1.71 Suspension data without student identities will be available from the Office of Pupil Personnel. It will consist of summary data containing the data items under 1.61.

1.72 Enrollment records maintained by the Office of Pupil Personnel.

1.73 Same as 1.71 - 1.72.

2.0 Question

2.01 Are there differences in criteria applied and reported by assistant principals for discipline?

a) Is there a significant variation in suspension rates of schools?

b) Is there a difference in the range of offenses for which Black and white students are suspended?

2.02 Are there differing perceptions among administrators, teachers, students, and parents regarding suspendable behavior and the suspension process?

a) How is the discipline code explained to students?

b) Are the rules well-defined and specific?

2.03 a) Is there a clearly defined due process procedure for suspension of students across the school district?

b) Is that procedure adhered to throughout the school district?

2.1 Objectives

2.11 a) To determine those behaviors that are considered suspendable offenses by school administrators.

b) To determine reported behaviors leading to suspension.

2.12 a) To determine perceptions of teachers regarding suspendable behavior and the suspension process.

b) To determine unacceptable behavior reported to the administration by teachers.

c) To determine perceptions of parents regarding suspendable behavior and the suspension process.

d) To determine perceptions of students.

2.13 a) To determine if there is a uniform suspension process for the school district.

b) To determine if the procedure is followed in all schools across the district.

2.2 Strategy

2.21 a) Interview assistant principals to determine the criteria for suspension.

b) Examine suspension reports for stated reasons for suspension.

c) Compare a) and b) for consistency.

2.22 a) Interview teachers for perceptions of suspendable behavior.

b) Examine records of teacher reports of unacceptable behavior.

c) Interview parents for perceptions of suspendable behavior.

2.23 a) Compare suspension process by school including events prior to, during, and after the actual suspension period.

2.3 Tasks

2.31 a) Develop and test interview format for principals.

b) Conduct interviews and compile results.

c) Record reasons for suspension from sample of student records.

d) Compare stated and recorded reasons for suspension.

2.32 a) Develop and test interview formats for teachers, parents, and students.

b) Conduct interviews with teachers and compile results.

c) Conduct interviews with parents and compile results.

d) Conduct interviews with students and compile results.

e) Compare responses of the three groups.

2.33 a) Locate written policy statement governing suspension process.

b) Include questions about the process in interviews with assistant principals.

c) Compare written policy and recorded process with interview responses.

2.4 Population

2.41 a) Volunteer principals.

2.42 a) Volunteer teachers, students, and parents.

b) Selected teachers.

c) Selected parents of suspended students.

d) Selected suspended students.

2.43 a) LEA administration.

2.5 Instrumentation

2.51 Interview format to be developed by data analyst.

2.6 Data Collection

2.61 a) Field test with selected principals.

b) Interviews with assistant principals by project staff.

c) Intern to record data from suspension records.

2.62 a) Field test with selected teachers, parents, and students.

b) Interns conduct interviews with parents in home.

c) Interviewers conduct interviews with parents in home.

d) Interviewers conduct interviews with students in home.

2.63 a) Contact with appropriate administration personnel for policy on suspension.

2.7 Sources of Data

2.71 a) Selected principals.

b) High School assistant principals.

c) Office of Pupil Personnel.

2.72 a) Selected teachers, parents, and students.

b) 90 teachers randomly selected in 6 schools.

c) 90 randomly selected parents of suspended students in 6 schools.

d) 90 randomly selected suspended students in 6 schools.

2.73 a) Principals

This plan represents procedures utilized to answer the research questions posed in 1.01 - 1.04 and 2.01 - 2.04.

Limitations of the Study

Suspension data were collected and analyzed for students in grades nine through twelve in the twenty-five secondary schools operating in the Jefferson County School District. All data utilized in the study were relative to students who were formally suspended from school.

The interviews that were conducted with students and parents were limited to a sample of suspended students and their respective parents. Samples of faculty, students, and parents were drawn from six secondary schools which had experienced the highest suspension rates for the period beginning 1 September 1976 through 15 October 1976.

The format in which the data were provided to project staff precluded the determination of the frequency of multiple suspensions for any individual student, i.e., suspension on more than one occasion during the school year. Data are arranged by the incidences of suspension, and by the number of students accounting for the incidences of suspension.

Another problem encountered centered around an accurate analysis of the length of suspensions imposed in individual suspension cases. The school district system for reporting and recording suspensions lacked sufficient uniformity to permit any meaningful comparisons of the amount of time that individual students were actually barred from school attendance. There was an apparent lack of understanding among school administrators regarding the uniform coding of the length of suspension imposed.

A major limitation of the study has been the denial of access to individual student suspension records. The position of the county school district administration is that there exists the potential for violation of the Family Rights and Privacy Act that could result in litigation. The decision to deny project staff access to individual records was based on the counsel of an attorney retained by the Board of Education. Though the project staff was given a contrary opinion by HEW counsel, staff had no alternative but to comply with the decision of school officials and utilize the summary suspension data provided.

Data Items and Sources

Information about suspensions and enrollments comprises a large portion of data utilized in this study. Data were gathered from several sources within the school district and are as valid as the primary sources.

Suspension data

The School District Office of Information Systems provided duplicate computer tapes of county suspension data for school years 1974-75, 1975-76, and 1976-77. Summary data by school were made available to project staff for each of the three quarters of each school year. A quarter represents fifty-eight or fifty-nine days of pupil attendance, for a total of 175 days a year during which school is in session. Former Louisville Independent School District suspension data for 1974-75 were compiled from monthly reports provided by the school district Office of Information and adjusted to correspond to the same time periods as county school data.

The following items were contained in the county suspension file for the 1976-77 school year:

1. Date of suspension (quarter - month - year)
2. Ethnicity/gender
3. School name
4. Violation
5. Length of suspension
6. Jurisdiction (local or central office)
7. Whether previously suspended
8. Grade level
9. School type (elementary, middle, secondary)

Files for school year 1974-75 and 1975-76 were not as complete, but contained school name and ethnicity/gender data, permitting some comparisons of the rates of suspensions by school and by ethnicity of suspended students. Comparisons are made with data for the same time period of each school year.

Enrollment Data

Current year (1976-77) county school enrollment data contained the following items:

1. Enrollment by grade level
2. Enrollment by ethnicity
3. Enrollment by gender

These data were collected for the period ending 29 September 1976 and were provided by the county school district Office of Information Systems.

County school enrollment data for 1975-76 were collected for the period ending 4 June 1976 from the Racial Report by Homeroom and School, provided by the Office of Information. The Pupil Personnel Office made available the Pupil Membership Report for the period ending 30 September 1974, from which 1974-75 enrollment data were derived. The administrative Office for the Superintendent provided the Desegregation Status Report for the former Louisville Independent School District which contained city enrollment data for 1974-75. Enrollment data for the period ending 23 September 1974 were utilized for comparisons.

Interview Data

Sampling Procedures

Principals of all 25 secondary schools were selected for inclusion in the interview schedule; however, one refused to consent to the interview, with one assistant principal substituting for a principal due to illness.

The faculty sample was drawn by assigning numbers to the alphabetical faculty roster, then selecting those subjects whose numbers matched fifteen randomly generated numbers in each of the six selected secondary schools, (seven additional subjects were selected as alternates but were not used). Individual faculty members were then contacted to obtain their consent for the interview, resulting in 84 completed interviews.

Selection of the student and parent samples was accomplished by the random selection of student suspension forms from the files of the six selected schools for the period September 1 to October 15, housed in the Office of Pupil Personnel. A request for participation in the interview schedule and a detailed statement of informed consent was then mailed to the parents of those students. Project staff were in the position of dealing with an intermediary (Office of Pupil Personnel) in contacting parents, a procedure that apparently affected the sample size. Three separate mailings and a telephone follow-up were done in an effort to secure the desired sample size of 90 subjects; however, only 49 subjects ultimately consented to the interviews. The final sample size of 49 represents approximately .08% of all suspended students in the six selected secondary schools during the six week period.

Administrators

Secondary school principals and one assistant principal of 24 secondary schools consented to be interviewed, with one principal declining to participate. Of this number, 3 (12.5%) were Black males and 21 (87.5%) were white males. Twelve (50.0%) were assigned to school with grades 7-12; 8 (33.3%) to schools with grades 10-12; and 4 (16.7%) to schools with grades 7-9.

The largest number, 8 (33.3%) had been assigned to their respective school for a period of 1 to 5 years; 5 (21.0%) for 6 to 10 years; 4 (16.8%) for 11-15 years; 3 (12.6%) for 16-20 years; 2 (8.4%) for 21-25 years; and 2 (8.4%) for 26-30 years.

Faculty

The faculty sample was randomly selected from six high schools and included 84 faculty members. The number of teachers per school ranged from 12-15. The ethnicity/gender composition of the faculty sample corresponds closely with that of the faculty population of those six schools and represents a 15.0% sample. A division of the sample by ethnicity/gender is as follows: white male 38.1%, white female 48.8%, Black male 4.8%, and Black female 7.1%, and other male 1.2%.

Teaching experience ranging from 6 to 10 years was reported by 34.5% of the subjects, 11 to 20 years by 28.6%, 1 to 5 years by 26.2%, and more than 20 years by 10.7%.

The sample included faculty assigned to 16 different subject areas or other instructional responsibilities in grades 7 through 12, with the largest number (46.2%) assigned to tenth through twelfth grade.

Students

A random sample of 49 secondary school students was selected from the total number of students suspended from the six secondary schools included in the interview schedule. Restrictions imposed in contacting prospective interviewees affected the anticipated sample size of 90 subjects.

Of the number of subjects (49) consenting to the interviews, 22 (44.9%) were bused, and 27 (55.1%) were not. A total of 30 (61.2%) of the subjects had attended the same school during the 1975-76 and 1976-77 school year. White males accounted for 22.4% of the sample, white females 26.5%, Black males 28.6%, and Black females 22.4%.

Every subject in the sample had been suspended at least once during the period 1 September 1976 to 15 October 1976. The largest portion of the sample (59.2%) had been suspended once, while 26.5% had been suspended twice, 8.2% three times, 2.0% four times, and 4.1% five times.

Parents

Parents of the randomly selected student sample were interviewed with their respective children. The ethnicity distribution of the parent sample is identical to the student sample.

Data Analysis

The statistical data displayed in this report are the results of procedures applied to a duplicate of the Jefferson County School District suspension file, provided to the Student Concerns Project, in tape form, by the school district's Office of Information.

Data was processed on the University of Kentucky's IBM 360 Computer in Lexington, Kentucky utilizing the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (2nd edition 1975) Computer Package.

The information in this report is predicated on three major sets of data:

1) Applying a crosstab routine, frequencies were established for suspensions at each school by ethnicity and grade level.
2) Utilizing a similar crosstab routine, and selecting only students who had not been previously suspended, frequencies were obtained for the actual number of students suspended at each school by ethnicity and grade level.
3) Using another crosstab routine, frequencies were established for each of the twenty seven suspension violations by the student's ethnicity for each school.

These sets of data were compiled for each of the three quarters of the 1976-77 school year as well as the year totals.

Suspension rates (%) are computed separately for Black and white students based on the number of suspensions and the population of a particular group (number of Black suspensions/number of Black students) to arrive at the suspension rate.

The discrepancy between the Black rate of suspension and the white rate of suspension is labeled as the percent of difference and is simply the difference between the two rates of suspension. This figure is computed for each school as well as the entire district.

Using the Black rate of suspension and the white rate of suspension at each school a Chi Square test was used to determine if the difference in suspension rates at that school for Black and white students could have occurred by chance.

In conjunction with the statistical analysis of the raw suspension data discussed above, structured interviews were held with secondary school principals, a sample of faculty members and suspended students and their parents.

Interview formats were designed to assess attitudes of the subjects toward suspension, as a process and a disciplinary action. There were six major areas of interest included: (1) procedures followed by school personnel in explaining rules, (2) perceptions of suspendable offenses, (3) provision of alternatives to suspension, (4) value of suspension, (5) equity of rules application, and (6) whether a readmission process is operable.

Forced-choice and open-ended items were included in the interview format. Correlation coefficients were computed for the responses of the subjects, utilizing the product-moment formula.

Definition of Terms

The following definitions are offered to maintain a level of consistency in presenting findings.

Suspension - A quasi-legal action by the administrator of an individual school that results in a student being denied attendance at that school for a specified time period.

Enrollment - The number of students officially enrolled in a given school, through a standard enrollment procedure.

County School System - Refers to the Jefferson County School System.

City School System - Refers to the former Louisville Independent Schools, prior to merger with the county system.

Ethnicity - A categorization of the ethnic origin of students, e.g., Black, white.

Gender - The categorization of students as male or female.

Disproportionate - As related to suspensions, a condition in which students of one ethnic origin are suspended at a rate that exceeds their representation of the total population.

Jefferson County Education Consortium - A tripartite organization composed of the Jefferson County School System; College of Education, University of Kentucky; and the University of Louisville. The primary objective of the organization is the marshalling of resources toward the resolution of educational problems.

High School - For the purposes of this study all schools, except the Brown School, having grades nine through twelve are considered high schools. (See note below)

Mean Suspension Rate - A rate computed by dividing the number of student suspensions by the number of students enrolled. Mean suspension rates are reported system-wide and by individual schools.

Note: The Brown School is unique among schools within the system. The school operates on the open-school philosophy with a student body selected to reflect ethnic balance and to provide representation from all segments of the community. The staff is self-selected and the program, which utilizes community resources, does not include athletic or vocational activities.

SECTION III

Results

RESULTS

Interviews

The results discussed in this section are based on the analysis of interviews with subjects from the six secondary schools evidencing the highest disproportionate suspension rates for the first six weeks of the 1976-77 school year, and are not generalizable beyond those specific schools. Responses of the administrator sample are, however, indicators of district-wide attitudes for that sub-group.

Phase I of the study is directed at the identification of schools that have disproportionate suspension rates for minority students and the probable causes for the disproportionality. A set of research questions was developed to provide a frame of reference in the investigation of probable cause.

The first research question to which the interview findings are relevant is:

1.02 Do attributes of ethnicity contribute to the disproportionate suspension rates for any ethnic group of students?

Administrators and faculty were asked to state reasons for the apparent disproportionate suspensions of Black students. More than half the administrators (54.2%) and slightly less than half of the faculty sample (47.6%) responded with statements that related to some assigned attributes of Black students. Those attributes included references to socioeconomic level, poor academic preparation, defiance of authority, loudness, and different cultural values.

The second and third most frequently stated reason given by the administrator and faculty samples respectively was that Black students break more school rules than do whites; the frequency of this response was considerably lower than for the previously discussed most frequent response (administrators, 16.7%; faculty, 21.4%).

Responses for administrators and faculty to the item asking for reasons for disproportionate suspensions were highly correlated (r = .98). There is a clear indication that attributes of ethnicity, specifically those of Black students, are considered by administrators and faculty to be contributing factors in the disproportionate suspensions of Black students.

A second question addressed perceptions of equal treatment of Black and white students.

1.03 Is there any indication of unequal application of discipline to students of any ethnic group?

Subjects in the faculty, parent, and student samples responded to items regarding equal treatment of Black and white students. The perceptions of students, parents, and faculty regarding equity are extremely diverse. Correlations for responses are as follows: students/faculty (r = -.22), parents/faculty (r = .28), students/parents (r = .86). Less than half of the faculty sample (46.4%) responded that Black and white students are treated equally in disciplinary cases all of the time; only 6.1% of the students and 16.3% of the parents interviewed responded that Black and white students are treated equally all of the time.

It must be noted that less than half of the subjects in the faculty sample felt that equal treatment was accorded to Black and white students all of the time. Subjects' responses indicate that there is some level of inequity of disciplinary actions operating in the schools from which samples are drawn.

Another interview item relating to equity asked which group of students, Black or white, were given preferential treatment. Diverse opinions were offered in responses to this item. Correlations between role groups suggest a positive relationship between the perceptions of parents and students (r = .95); a negative relationship between the perceptions of students and teachers (r = -.80); and a negative relationship between the perceptions of parents and teachers (r = -.72). There was an almost equal distribution of parent and student responses regarding preferential treatment for white or Black students. The distribution of the sample, white (48.9%) and Black (51.1%), probably accounts for the equal distribution of responses. There is no clear indication from the interview data whether Black or white students receive preferential treatment.

Responses to interview items regarding preferential treatment for male or female students, irrespective of ethnicity, reveal a high level of agreement across three groups of subjects; parents/faculty (r = .96), students/faculty (r = .93), and students/parents (r = .95). Approximately one-third of each group of subjects, parents and students (32.0%), faculty (35.7%) stated that females were accorded preferential treatment in regard to discipline.

An additional set of research questions were developed to assess the perceptions of various role groups regarding suspensions.

2.01 Are there differences in criteria applied and reported by assistant principals for discipline?

Of those subjects who had read their respective suspension reports, (parents 75.5%, students 61.2%), more parents (67.3%) than students (38.8%) responded that the reports were accurate. These responses are inconsistent with those of other items included as cross-checks. A high percentage of students (83.7%) indicated that the suspension report contained the true reason for their suspension, while 6.1% didn't know.

Additional items elicited responses concerning whether the stated offense resulting in suspension was the same as the offense for which the student had been referred to the office. Responses indicated that parents (81.6%) and students (89.8%) were in agreement that the stated reason for referral and suspension were consistent.

There seems to be little evidence of any substantial difference in criteria applied and reported by assistant principals for discipline.

2.02 Are there differing perceptions among administrators, teachers, students, and parents regarding suspendable behavior and the suspension process?

Subjects were asked to enumerate conditions and behaviors that they felt should be considered as suspendable offenses. The most frequent responses and their rankings follows:

	Admin.	Faculty	Parents	Students
Endangering others	1	1	1	1
Disrespect for authority	2	-	4	-
Cutting, tardiness	4	3	3	2
Disruption of class	5	4	3	4
Verbal abuse	4	2	4	3
Drugs, alcohol	3	5	2	3

There are apparent differences in the importance assigned to each of the behaviors by each group of subjects. Calculation of correlation coefficients for the frequencies of responses results in the following: administrators/faculty (r = .47), administrators/ students (r = .67), students/faculty (r = .67), parents/faculty (r = .69).

Subjects in the parent sample responded to an item concerning their knowledge of and agreement with the suspension policy in the following manner: 24.5% knew and agreed with the policy, 36.7% knew and disagreed, with 38.8% lacking knowledge about the policy.

More students (63.3%) than parents (40.8%) regarded suspension as a severe punishment; however, slightly more than half the parents (51%) indicated that they had administered additional punishment as a result of the suspension.

Opinions regarding the negative effects of suspension on students were elicited from all subjects. The most frequent response to this inquiry was the "exclusion of the student from classroom instruction"; administrators (87.5%), students (65.3%), parents (49.7%), and faculty (47.6%).

2.02 a) How is the discipline code explained to students?

Several items were included in the interview schedule to determine the procedures utilized to explain the discipline code to students. A variety of procedures and settings were indicated. The following procedures are most frequently cited: (1) homeroom period, - administrators 79.2%, faculty 60.7%; (2) class period - administrators 37.5%, faculty 48.8%; (3) public address announcement - administrators 62.5%, faculty 65.5%. School personnel sampled appear to be in agreement about procedures (r = .88). However, comparison of responses of students and administrators result in much less agreement (r = .19), concerning procedures.

2.03 a) Is there a clearly defined due process procedure for suspension of students across the school district?

b) Is that procedure adhered to throughout the school district?

The interview schedule addresses only 2.03 b). Subjects in the student sample gave the following responses when asked if they knew they had violated a specific rule prior to their suspension; 77.6% yes, and 22.4% no. More than half the students (59.2%) indicated that they had an opportunity to tell their side of the story prior to being suspended. Of this number, 28.6% felt that they were listened to, with 26.5% feeling they were not listened to.

Responses by parents, administrators and students indicated consistency in the procedures for notifying parents of suspension; parents/administrators (r = .88) and parents/students (r = .93). Administrators responded that parents are notified by telephone and by mail (95.8%).

There were limited instances of alternatives offered to students; 8.2% responded that corporal punishment was an alternative, with 89.9% indicating that no alternatives were offered.

The due process procedure seems to be adhered to throughout the school district.

Suspension Data

This section reports results from analysis of suspension data.

1.01 Are there student characteristics or combinations of characteristics that are most often present among those students who are suspended?

Analysis of suspension data provides a limited description of the most frequently suspended students. Characteristics of these students include being Black, being males, and being in the ninth grade.

Black males account for 35.7% of the total suspensions of secondary students, with white males (32.0%), Black females (16.8%), and white females (15.3%), comprising the balance. Black males and females account for 52.5% of all suspensions, but comprise only 21.6% of the secondary enrollment.

1.02 Do attributes of ethnicity contribute to the disproportionate suspension rates for any ethnic group of students?

The nature of the suspension data precludes any conclusive support for an affirmative answer to this question. However, the suspension of 44 Black students per 100 enrolled, compared with 12 white students per 100 enrolled, indicates that the probability of being suspended increases sharply on the basis of ethnicity. These rates are calculated from the numbers of individual students suspended at least once during the 1976-77 school year, and are computed from district-wide averages.

Suspension rates were computed for Black and white students from the reported incidences of suspension, as well as the number of individual students involved. Utilizing the former method, there are recorded 65.3 incidences of suspension of Black students per 100 enrolled, compared to 16.3 incidences of suspensions of white students per 100 enrolled. The disparity in the numbers indicates that Black students' chances of being suspended are four times greater than that of white students.

1.03 Is there any indication of unequal application of discipline to students of any ethnic group?

An examination of the previously stated rates of suspension reveals an unequal distribution of suspensions between Black and white students, but does not clearly substantiate any indication of unequal application of discipline. Results of the interview analysis, discussed under 1.03 on p. 70 of this section, provide additional data relevant to this question.

2.01 a) Is there a significant variation in suspension rates at schools?

Suspension totals for individual secondary schools range from 9.5 to 49.3 incidences of suspension per 100 students enrolled, with a mean of 26.9. (See Table 1 p. 103). Rates for the incidences of suspension per 100 Black students enrolled, range from 33.1 to 144.1, with the same computation for white student suspensions yielding a range from 5.1 to 33.6 per 100 students enrolled. The lowest rates of suspension incidents for Black students (33.1 per 100) is roughly equivalent to the highest rate for white students (33.6 per 100).

Total and disproportionate suspension rates for each school were weighted, with the county-wide mean assigned a value of 1.00. Eleven schools exceed this value which indicates high total and disportionate suspension rates. There are no discernible patterns with regard to the geographic location of those schools exceeding the value of 1.00. To the contrary, suspension rates vary widely, even between schools comprising attendance areas designated as "clusters" in the county's busing plan. There is a significant variation in suspension rates at schools, in the total incidences of suspension, and the rates of suspension for Black and white students. (See Table 1 p. 103).

The ratio of Black to white student suspensions, based on enrollment for each school is presented in Table 3 p. 105 . These figures indicate that in every school, except two, Black students are suspended in numbers which exceed their representation in the student population. Based on enrollment, Black to white student suspension should be 1:1. Iroquois and Male are the two schools with ratio figures close to the expected (1.8:1 and 1.4:1 respectively).

A comparison of the ratios in Table 3 and the rates in Table 1 indicates that a school with relatively low overall suspension rates and a low Black student suspension rate may be suspending Black students in numbers which exceed their representation in the total enrollment. Waggener, for example, ended the 1976-77 school year with a 10.9% overall rate and a 34.8% Black student suspension rate (number of Black student suspensions divided by the number of Black students enrolled), but the ratio of Black to white student suspensions, based on enrollment (Black suspension rate divided by white suspension rate) is 6.2:1. More than six Black students, per hundred enrolled, are suspended for every one white student, per hundred enrolled. Fairdale has the highest ratio of Black to white student suspensions at 10.5:1.

2.01 b) Is there a difference in the range of offenses for which Black and white students are suspended?

The percentages reported in this section reflect the proportion of Black to white suspensions attributable to a specific offense.

Suspensions for offenses which might be categorized as avoidance, i.e. "excessive class cutting," "excessive tardiness to school and class," account for 46.0% of all reported secondary student suspensions.

The most frequent violation for all students is "excessive cutting of class," accounting for 27.9% of Black student suspensions and 38.7% of white student suspensions. "Tardiness to class" accounts for 10.6% of Black student suspensions, compared with 8.6% of suspensions of white students. (See Table 8 p. 110).

The overall ratio of Black to white suspensions, by offense, based on enrollment is 4:1 (see Table 4 p. 106). These figures show that Black students are more likely to be suspended for all of the offenses except "walkout participation". For the other offenses, the ratios range from 1.8:1 for smoking violations to a high of 63:1 for extortion. Violations of the dress code are offenses for which Black students are next likely to be suspended. The ratio of Black to white student suspensions for this offense is 51:1.

An analysis of suspension by offense based on the percent of white and Black students suspended for those offenses (Table 8 p. 110) does not truly reflect the degree of disproportionality of suspensions by offense. The ratios of Black to white student suspensions by offense, based on enrollment (Table 4 p. 106) more accurately reflects the degree to which Black students are suspended by offense based on their representation in the total enrollment. The two computations indicate little difference in the overall range of offenses for which Black and white students are suspended. The critical issue is that Black students were suspended more often for any of the offenses except "walkout participation".

SECTION IV

Findings

FINDINGS

The discussion in this section will provide a synthesis of results derived from the analysis of suspension data and interview data, and will address the major research questions.

1.01 Are there student characteristics or combinations of characteristics that are most often present among those students who are suspended?

The suspension reporting system of the school district permits only a cursory identification of specific characteristics of the most frequently suspended students. It is apparent from available suspension data that Black, male, ninth grade students are suspended more frequently than any other group. There are indications from interview data that non-participation in extra-curricular activities is also an identifiable characteristic of the most frequently suspended students.

1.02 Do attributes of ethnicity contribute to the disproportionate suspension rate for any ethnic group of students?

There appears to be sufficient evidence to indicate that school personnel (faculty and administrators) believe that attributes of ethnicity do contribute to the disproportionate suspension rates for Black students (see p. 69). This finding is supported by selected teacher comments from A Report of Student Suspensions in Selected High Schools of Jefferson County, a study conducted at the direction of Federal Judge James Gordon in April, 1976 by a suspension review team. Teacher comments included several statements referencing Black students' aggressiveness, defiance of authority, and difficulty in adjusting to the rules of the school. Attributes such as these, as well as attributes indicated in the responses to interviews in the current study, are assigned attributes which are unrelated to ethnicity. (See p. 70). These attributes are not inherent in ethnicity; rather they reflect the perceptions of an ethnic group by others, and create a close approximation of stereotyping. (See Section I, p. 36).

Suspension data in Table 4 p. 106 , indicate that the probability of Black students being suspended is four times that for white students. These data, in addition to interview data, suggest some indication that assigned attributes of ethnicity do contribute to the disproportionate suspension rates for Black students.

1.03 Is there any indication of unequal application of discipline to students of any ethnic group?

Attempts to provide a definitive answer to this question have been essentially thwarted by the sensitive nature of the issue, and the apparent ambivalence of subjects' responses. If it may be assumed that equal treatment for all students should be expected unconditionally, there is a clear indication that, in the opinion of a substantial percentage of those subjects interviewed, there exists an unequal application of discipline. (See p. 70). This is corroborated by a survey of student opinion conducted by the Department of Research and Evaluation, Jefferson County Public Schools in the spring of 1976. Student responses indicated that approximately one-third of all those sampled in grades 7 through 12 (N=10,000) felt that students receive "unequal treatment because of race'. The percentage of Black and white students so responding is almost equal (Black students = 36%; white students = 35%). The same survey found that Black students (41%) felt that whites receive preferential treatment, while whites (35%) felt that preferential treatment was accorded Blacks. This finding is consistent with findings of the present study, in that subjects responded that members of the other ethnic group received preferential treatment. (See p. 71).

The findings of this study do not support any suggestion that unequity occurs at the point of reporting suspendable behavior to parents and other school officials. Students stated that the behavior reported on the suspension forms was accurate, and that there was consistency between the reason for the initial referral and the subsequent suspension. If perceptions of inequity are justified, it did not fall within the scope of this study to discern the point at which the discipline process becomes unequal. Presently no information base or school records exists which document each suspension with a description of all behaviors, beginning with the initial referral.

The strength of the body of data suggesting perceptions of inequity among all role groups cannot be taken lightly. The data of this study and data of the school system's surveys suggest that administrators, teachers, parents, and students feel that discipline treatment is unequal because of race. Suspension rates for Black and white students should be equal--given a condition of equity of treatment relative to discipline. Since the primary reason offered by teachers and administrators to explain the disproportionate suspension of Black students has to do with assigned characteristics of the student, and since the ratio of Black to white suspensions is 4 to 1, one might infer that Black students are recipients of unequal treatment.

2.01 Are there differences in criteria applied and reported by assistant principals for discipline?

The application of criteria for disciplinary actions requires judgements by, for the most part, assistant principals. These criteria are specifically defined by the discipline code, but the code permits considerable latitude in offense categories such as "disruption" and "disobedience." It appears from the level of agreement between parents and students regarding the consistency of information in the suspension reports (see p. 72), that there are no discernible differences in criteria applied and reported by assistant principals.

If there are differences in the application and reporting of criteria for suspensions, they are so subtle and enmeshed in the suspension procedure, that the type and extent of records currently maintained by the school system do not permit detection of such differences.

2.01 a) Is there a significant variation in suspension rates of schools?

The question may be answered affirmatively. Table 1 (p. 103) shows a wide range in the overall school suspension rates. While the rates for total and sub-group suspensions may vary, in no case does the rate of Black student suspensions equal the rate of white student suspensions.

Table 3 (p. 105) shows the ratio of Black to white student suspensions, by school, based on Black and white enrollment in each school. The first column concerns the incidences of suspension in each school, and the second column is concerned with the number of students suspended (unduplicated count). These ratio figures should be 1:1 if Black and white students were suspended at rates equal to their representation in the total enrollment.

Iroquois and Male are the only schools which suspended Black and white students in numbers which approximate their representation in the total enrollment (1.8:1 and 1.4:1 respectively). All other schools suspended Black students at a ratio which is at least two times what might be expected based on enrollment. In some cases, individual Black students were suspended at ratios over 7:1.

2.01 b) Is there a difference in the range of offenses for which Black and white students are suspended?

There are differences in the percentages of Black and white student suspensions for specific offenses. The most obvious are the offenses of "disruption/disobedience in the classroom", and "profanity", for which Black students are suspended at twice the rate of whites. (See p. 78). A greater percentage of white student suspensions occurs for offenses of "excessive cutting of class", "excessive tardiness to school", "possession or selling of drugs" (twice the rate for Black students), and "smoking in an unassigned area."

The rate of suspension of Black and white students for fighting is approximately equal, but more Black students are suspended for assault. These rates, based on a percent of students in each subgroup suspended for a particular offense over the number students in that same group suspended, do not offer a clear understanding of the impact of the offense function on the number of Black and white students suspended based on enrollment. The ratio figures reported in Table 4 (p. 106) illustrate that, based on population, Black students are suspended four times more often than white students for all offenses for which suspensions are reported except one (walkout participation).

The ratio of Black to white student suspensions is less than 2:1 for only four of the twenty-seven offenses. These are possession or selling of drugs (1.9:1), possession of explosives or fireworks (1.5:1), smoking in unassigned area (1.8:1), and walkout participation .9:1). While Black students are being suspended at a rate above that which may be expected, based on their representation in the total population of students for three of these offenses, the ratios indicate that suspensions for these offenses are more in proportion to representation in the total population than suspensions for any of the other twenty-three offenses.

The rather high ratios of Black to white student suspensions, for all but a few of the offenses, could be suggestive of the kind of defensive posture described by Sikes (See Section I, p. 47). The offenses listed by Sikes as defenses employed by Black students in desegregated settings are quite similar to those offenses for which Black students are disproportionally suspended in this system, i.e. extortion, fighting, classroom disruption. The ratio of 51:1 Black to white student suspensions for dress code violations would indicate that the manner in which Black students dress is very likely to be judged unacceptable.

It should be noted that ratios, as discussed in this report, should be 1:1, if conditions reflected equal treatment of Black and white students. The degree to which the ratios differ from the expected of 1:1 is the degree of disproportionality of treatment based on representation in the total population. It is not possible to state an expected rate of suspension within the entire school system or within a given school for any group, because such a standard has not been established.

2.02 Are there differing perceptions among administrators, teachers, students, and parents regarding suspendable behavior and the suspension process?

Correlation coefficients reveal a rather low level of agreement between the various groups of subjects when asked what behavior constitutes a suspendable offense. There is obvious agreement about "endangering" behaviors. (See p. 72). It would seem that with the exception of "endangering others", each role group responded by listing behaviors that would directly impact them. For example, administrators gave second priority to "disrespect of authority"; teachers gave second priority to "verbal abuse"; students placed second priority on "class cutting and tardiness"; and parents gave second priority to "drugs and alcohol."

Parents are not aware of the school system's definition of suspendable behavior. They seem to be ill-informed about the discipline code and suspension policy of the Jefferson County School District. Slightly less than one-fourth had knowledge of the policy and agreed with it. (See p. 73). Similar results were found in A Report of Student Suspensions in Selected High Schools of Jefferson County Public Schools. From interviews with 139 parents of suspended students, only one-fourth had read the Disciplinary Procedures handbook. The following sums up parental reaction to suspension as a discipline device:

> There was general agreement among the parents that suspension is not a deterrent and should be used only in serious incidents. In minor incidents such as cutting, tardiness, and smoking, the parents believed the school should develop other methods or more constructive ways to discipline.

This is in contrast to the affirmative responses of principals (7%) and faculty (7%) when asked whether suspension was used too frequently as a discipline device. These results are reported in a Needs Assessment, conducted in 1976 by the school district's Department of Research and Evaluation, (N=3600).

While parents feel that suspension should not be used too frequently and not at all for offenses of cutting and tardiness, teachers and administrators do not feel that suspension is used too frequently. It should be noted that the most frequent offenses for Black and white students are cutting and excessive tardiness.

There is evidence of parental opposition to suspension except in serious incidents, but there are some differences of opinion between Black and white parents. The results of a poll conducted in Jefferson County in 1976 by Louis Harris and Associates, for the Institute of Policy Sciences and Public Affairs, Duke University, show that 52% of the white parents indicated too frequent use of suspension was not at all a serious problem, while 53% of Black parents indicated it was a very serious problem. Unfair administration of discipline was not considered a serious problem by white parents (45%), while Black parents (46%) indicated that it was a very serious problem.

There appears to be some level of agreement among school personnel regarding suspension and the suspension process, but there seems to be little agreement between parents/students and school personnel. A polarization of attitudes and perceptions is apparent from results of the previously cited Needs Assessment in which principals and teachers indicated that a lack of parental support in solving discipline problems, and inadequate parental encouragement and support of student achievement and success are major needs which the system must address.

There are, quite clearly, differing perceptions among administrators, teachers, students, and parents regarding suspendable behavior and the suspension process.

Parental lack of knowledge about the suspension rules is repeatedly indicated, a condition which likely exacerbates the differing perceptions held by them and school personnel.

2.02 a) How is the discipline code explained to students?

There seems to be no uniform, district-wide, method for informing students of the provisions of the discipline code. The homeroom was the most frequent setting for explanations, with regular classroom and public address announcements also being utilized. Procedures vary from school to school, and within each school there is lack of agreement on procedure used in that school.

2.02 b) Are the rules well-defined and specific?

The Jefferson County Board of Education adopted, published, and distributed a student discipline code in December, 1976, which defines unacceptable behavior and possible consequences for such behavior. Additionally, many individual schools publish and distribute student handbooks with specific guidelines relative to that particular school.

These guidelines may concern behavior which is not spoken to in the system-wide code. For example, students may be restricted to certain areas in the building during the lunch hour. A student who doesn't conform with this requirement may be suspended for any one of several offenses on the system-wide list (insubordination, violation of school rule). Students are required to know what is expected of them at the district level and at the local school level.

2.03 a) Is there a clearly defined due process procedure for suspension of students across the school district?

Due process procedures are explained fully in Discipline Procedure, A Handbook for Personnel, Jefferson County Board of Education. Formal and informal due process is described in detail, as an aid to staff in handling disciplinary actions.

2.03 b) Is that procedure adhered to throughout the school district?

The results of interviews conducted as a part of the current study do not indicate any substantial procedural variations in the due process procedures. There is, as a part of the informal due process prescribed in the Discipline Procedure, the opportunity for the student to present his/her version of the incident. Slightly more than half the students (59.2%) interviewed indicated that they had an opportunity to present their version of the incident, prior to being suspended. The small size of the sample (N=49) raises some doubts about the validity of this finding, although it indicates some degree of variation from the due process procedure. An assessment of the degree of deviation from due process procedures within each school cannot be made at this point in the study.

Another indication of variance from the procedure is an item in the school district Needs Assessment to which principals (31%), teachers (39%), and central office staff (40%) responded that the interpretation of the disciplinary code is not uniform among schools.

It isn't clear from this report how "interpretation of the disciplinary code" is defined, and it should be noted that in some cases, respondents were comparing their specific school with other schools, a comparison which some may not be qualified to make, considering there are twenty-five secondary schools in the school district.

There is insufficient empirical evidence to establish that the due process procedures are disregarded throughout the school district; however, there are indications that in some instances, these procedures are not closely adhered to.

SECTION V

Conclusions

Conclusions

1. Black students are more likely to be suspended for all the suspendable offenses except one. However, the high frequency of suspensions of students of both ethnic groups for class avoidance behavior suggests that class attendance is a problem for both groups.

2. The system-wide Discipline Procedure (adopted December, 1975) published by the Jefferson County School System states the offenses for which a student can be suspended from school. These offenses fall with two classifications, exacting, (example: Willful and unauthorized cutting of three scheduled classes within a quarter), and judgemental (example: Disruptive behavior within the confines of school property). Interpretation and implementation of the Discipline Procedure varies from school to school. The degree of variance has not yet been measured.

In addition to the system-wide Discipline Procedure a number of schools publish student handbooks which state policies and procedures specific to that particular school. For example: The north stairs will be used for UP traffic, and the south stairs for DOWN traffic.

The method used to inform students of the Discipline Procedure and of school specific policies varies from school to school, but in all cases involved in this study, the rules are explained to the student body. While faculty members in the interview sample suggest students not knowing the rules as a reason for disproportionate Black student suspensions, there is no evidence which indicates that students are uninformed regarding rules.

3. It is further concluded that very different perceptions regarding suspension are held by administrators, faculty, parents, and students. School staff do not seem to share the concern of parents regarding the frequency with which suspension is utilized as a disciplinary device. While neither group may be fully aware of specific suspension rates for this school district, parents' responses may reflect a bias, since samples were selected from a pool of parents of students who had been suspended. This group, due to their experience with suspension, probably indicated a greater degree of concern about the frequency of suspension than they would have, had their child not been suspended. However, there is sufficient evidence from this and other studies (See Findings, p. 87) to indicate that parents feel that suspension is too frequently used.

There seems to be agreement among all groups that the most negative aspect of suspension is the loss of instructional time by the suspended student. It was not possible to analyze the extent of exclusion from class attendance as a result of suspension, due to the nature of record-keeping utilized by the various schools. Further, there does not seem to be a uniform policy covering "make up" work for those classes missed by a student while on suspension. If a student is not permitted to make up missed class work, it would seem that he/she is being doubly punished.

All groups indicated that behavior posing the threat of injury to staff or other students should result in suspension. There was much less agreement among subjects about other types of behavior for which students should be suspended. It is apparent that each group of subjects ranked suspendable behavior based on their own roles and relationships to the school.

To illustrate, the second most frequently cited suspendable behaviors offered by the different role groups were: administrators - "disrespect for authority"; faculty - "verbal abuse"; parents - "drugs, alcohol"; students - "cutting, tardiness". Each group appeared to respond with behaviors which could impact the performance of their respective duties.

4. Administrators and faculty evidenced a high level of agreement in explaining the disproportionate suspensions of Black students. The most frequently cited reasons were related to assigned attributes of Blacks, none of which are inherent in ethnicity. All of these attributes were based on the perceptions of faculty and administrators about Black students. The impact of these perceptions is likely to be felt as decisions about unacceptable student behaviors are made by school personnel. Research in teacher/student relationships has established the importance of teacher perceptions of students, and how those perceptions influence student behavior and achievement (see Teachers and Students in the Desegregated Setting, p. 36). When teacher perceptions of students are negative, student behavior and achievement will reflect that negativism.

The references made to attributes of ethnicity by subjects in the administrator and faculty samples provide sufficient evidence to conclude that ethnicity is a contributing factor in the disproportionate suspension rates of Black students.

5. There is sufficient evidence based on the analysis of interview data to indicate the existence of unequal application of discipline within the school district. Other previously cited studies (see Findings, p. 82) and the force of numerical data herein presented provide further support for this conclusion.

The suspension process as outlined in the discipline code provides for formal and informal due process procedures, when the student has been referred to the office for an alleged violation of a rule. The formal or informal suspension procedure begins at that point, but precipitating events that occur in the classroom, hallways, or other school locations hold the potential for unequal application of discipline.

Additionally, there is some variation in the interpretation of the discipline code among the secondary schools. Individual schools have rules or guidelines for behavior that are different from those in the published discipline code.

SECTION VI

Recommendations

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the conclusions reached in this study, the following recommendations are offered:

1. An accurate data system should be developed to facilitate a more thorough analysis of the suspension process. The data system should include information relative to the initial referral for disciplinary action, student specific information, and the resultant disposition of the referral.

2. Procedures need to be established to create a greater awareness of the discipline code among parents. It is apparent that parents' knowledge of the code is very limited. Parent workshops and media presentations or other such methods could be utilized to inform parents about the provisions of the code.

3. Alternatives to suspension should be developed, evaluated, and implemented. (Project staff are currently involved in such activities in four target schools).

4. It is also recommended that suspendable offenses be limited to those behaviors which are potentially harmful to the physical well being of others and behaviors which are criminal in nature.

5. A further recommendation is to encourage individual school staff to re-examine the guidelines for behavior in their specific schools for any possible rules that might tend to precipitate, rather than discourage unacceptable behavior.

6. The need for staff development activities in the areas of cultural pluralism and values clarification is indicated. Teachers and administrators must be given an opportunity to understand the degree to which their attitudes and behavior impacts the behavior and attitudes of students.

7. The number of total suspensions for all students resulting from avoidance behavior requires further investigation. Such an investigation should seek to determine the probable causes of this type of behavior so that appropriate corrective measures can be developed.

SECTION VII

Tables

School district cumulative

Individual school

Table 1
Incidences of Suspensions for 1976-77 School Year

School	BLACK Population	BLACK Suspensions	BLACK %	WHITE Population	WHITE Suspensions	WHITE %	TOTAL Population	TOTAL Suspensions	TOTAL %	Differen %
Atherton	321	106	33.1	1,226	97	7.9	1,547	203	13.1	25.2
Ahrens	409	204	49.9	1,087	246	22.6	1,496	450	30.1	27.3
Ballard	332	381	114.8	1,354	233	17.2	1,686	614	36.4	97.6
Butler	506	345	68.2	1,271	107	8.4	1,777	452	25.4	59.8
Central	364	209	57.4	1,297	225	17.3	1,661	434	26.1	40.1
Doss	266	81	30.5	1,055	45	4.3	1,321	126	9.5	26.2
Durrett	210	196	93.3	1,273	330	25.9	1,483	526	35.5	67.4
Eastern	210	181	86.2	1,099	201	18.3	1,309	382	29.2	67.9
Fairdale	235	126	53.6	1,179	60	5.1	1,414	186	13.2	48.5
Fern Creek	269	370	137.5	1,195	346	28.9	1,464	716	48.9	108.6
Iroquois	576	203	35.2	1,653	321	19.4	2,229	524	23.5	15.8
Thomas Jeff.	485	197	40.6	997	153	15.3	1,482	350	23.6	25.3
Jeffersontown	310	135	43.5	1,409	98	6.9	1,719	233	13.6	36.6
Male	164	67	40.8	1,028	296	28.8	1,192	363	30.5	12.0
Manual	785	593	75.4	1,565	267	17.1	2,350	860	36.5	58.3
Moore	306	217	70.9	1,333	200	15.0	1,639	417	25.4	55.9
Pleasure Ridge	331	323	97.6	1,362	326	23.9	1,693	649	38.3	73.7
Seneca	305	96	31.5	1,191	102	8.6	1,496	198	13.2	22.9
Shawnee	317	167	52.7	853	137	16.1	1,170	304	25.9	36.6
Southern	308	335	108.8	1,543	518	33.6	1,851	853	46.1	75.2
Stuart	297	428	144.1	1,162	291	25.1	1,459	719	49.3	119.0
Valley	287	144	50.2	1,123	137	12.2	1,410	281	19.9	38.0
Waggener	253	88	34.8	1,144	64	5.6	1,397	152	10.9	29.2
Western	410	165	40.2	1,447	92	6.4	1,857	257	13.8	33.8
Westport	283	212	74.9	1,040	124	11.9	1,323	336	25.4	63.0
TOTAL	8,539	5,569	65.3	30,886	5,016	16.3	39,425	10,585	26.9	49.0

Table 2
Number of Students Suspended for 1976-77 School Year

School	BLACK Population	BLACK Suspensions	BLACK %	WHITE Population	WHITE Suspensions	WHITE %	TOTAL Population	TOTAL Suspensions	TOTAL %	Differenc %
Atherton	321	89	27.7	1,226	93	7.6	1,547	182	11.8	20.1
Ahrens	409	175	42.8	1,087	217	20.0	1,496	392	26.2	22.8
Ballard	332	211	63.5	1,354	155	11.4	1,686	366	21.7	52.1
Butler	506	263	52.0	1,271	90	7.1	1,777	353	19.9	44.9
Central	364	152	41.8	1,297	199	15.3	1,661	351	21.1	26.5
Doss	266	67	25.2	1,055	37	3.5	1,321	104	7.9	21.7
Durrett	210	119	56.7	1,273	248	19.5	1,483	367	24.7	37.2
Eastern	210	98	46.7	1,099	142	12.9	1,309	240	18.3	33.8
Fairdale	235	75	31.9	1,179	47	4.0	1,414	122	8.6	27.9
Fern Creek	269	224	83.3	1,195	283	23.7	1,464	507	34.6	59.6
Iroquois	576	151	26.2	1,653	273	16.5	2,229	424	19.0	9.7
Thomas Jeff.	485	140	28.9	997	123	12.3	1,482	263	17.7	16.6
Jeffersontown	310	72	23.2	1,409	59	4.1	1,719	131	7.6	19.1
Male	164	44	26.8	1,028	211	20.5	1,192	255	21.4	6.3
Manual	785	465	59.2	1,565	244	15.6	2,350	709	30.1	43.6
Moore	306	156	51.0	1,333	164	12.3	1,639	320	19.5	38.7
Pleasure Ridge	331	168	50.8	1,362	189	13.9	1,693	357	21.1	36.9
Seneca	305	83	27.2	1,191	88	7.4	1,496	171	11.4	19.8
Shawnee	317	122	38.5	853	120	14.1	1,170	242	20.7	24.4
Southern	308	211	68.5	1,543	411	26.6	1,851	622	33.6	41.9
Stuart	297	228	76.8	1,162	214	18.4	1,459	442	30.3	58.4
Valley	287	103	36.2	1,123	104	9.2	1,410	207	14.7	27.0
Waggener	253	61	24.1	1,144	61	5.3	1,397	122	8.7	18.8
Western	410	120	29.3	1,447	82	5.7	1,857	202	10.9	23.6
Westport	283	142	50.2	1,040	108	10.4	1,323	250	18.9	39.8
TOTAL	8,639	3,739	43.8	30,886	3,962	12.8	39,425	7,701	19.5	31.6

Table 3
Ratio of Black to White Student Suspension Rates

School	Black:White Incidences of Suspension	Black:White Students Suspended
Atherton	4.2:1	3.6:1
Ahrens	2.2:1	2.1:1
Ballard	6.7:1	5.6:1
Butler	8.1:1	7.3:1
Central	3.3:1	2.7:1
Doss	7.1:1	7.2:1
Durrett	3.6:1	2.9:1
Eastern	4.7:1	7.6:1
Fairdale	10.5:1	7.9:1
Fern Creek	4.8:1	3.5:1
Iroquois	1.8:1	1.6:1
Thomas Jefferson	2.7:1	2.3:1
Jeffersontown	6.3:1	5.6:1
Male	1.4:1	1.3:1
Manual	4.4:1	3.8:1
Moore	4.7:1	4.1:1
Pleasure Ridge	4.1:1	3.7:1
Seneca	4.1:1	3.7:1
Shawnee	3.3:1	2.7:1
Southern	3.2:1	2.6:1
Stuart	5.7:1	4.2:1
Valley	4.1:1	3.9:1
Waggener	6.2:1	4.5:1
Western	6.3:1	5.1:1
Westport	6.3:1	4.8:1
Total	4.0:1	3.5:1

Table 4

Ratio of Black to White Student Suspension Rates by Offense

Offense	Black Suspensions #	Black Suspensions %	White Suspensions #	White Suspensions %	Ratio Black:White
1. Arson	16	.18	9	.02	9:1
2. Assault on Staff	72	.87	19	.06	14.5:1
3. Assault on Student	91	1.07	27	.08	13.4:1
4. Burglary/Theft	125	1.47	36	.11	13.4:1
5. Bus Conduct	43	.51	13	.04	12.8:1
6. Destruction of property	23	.26	24	.07	3.7:1
7. Disruption/Disobedience (classroom)	839	9.84	374	1.21	8.1:1
8. Disruption/Disobedience (non-classroom)	672	7.87	530	1.71	4.6:1
9. Disruption/Disobedience (ex. curr. act.)	14	.16	16	.05	3.2:1
10. Excessive cutting of class	1,551	18.17	1,948	6.30	2.9:1
11. Extortion	54	.63	1	.00	63:1
12. Excessive tardiness (class)	589	6.89	430	1.39	4.9:1
13. Excessive tardiness (school)	125	1.46	216	.69	2.1:1
14. Fighting	499	5.85	354	1.14	5.1:1
15. Gambling	13	.15	5	.01	15:1
16. Indecent Exposure	2	.02	3	.00	2.4:1
17. Loitering/Trespassing	176	2.07	79	.25	8.3:1
18. Possession of alcoholic beverages	32	.37	45	.14	2.6:1
19. Possession or selling of drugs	87	1.02	168	.54	1.9:1
20. Possession of explosives or fireworks	3	.03	9	.02	1.5:1
21. Possession of weapons	12	.14	16	.05	2.8:1
22. Profanity or vulgarity	208	2.43	81	.26	9.3:1
23. Selling goods illegally	2	.02	1	.00	7.2:1
24. Smoking in unassigned area	194	2.28	399	1.29	1.8:1
25. Truancy (over 16 yrs. of age)	27	.32	41	.13	2.5:1
26. Walkout participation	58	.68	229	.74	.9:1
27. Violation of dress code	43	.51	3	.00	51.8:1
TOTAL	5,569	65.27	5,016	16.30	4:1

Table 5

School	Degree of Variance From Weighted $\overline{X}$ Suspensions . Disproportionality *
Atherton	.25
Ahrens	.62
Ballard	2.69
Butler	1.15
Central	.97
Doss	.18
Durrett	1.81
Eastern	1.50
Fairdale	.48
Fern Creek	4.01
Iroquois	.28
Thomas Jefferson	.45
Jeffersontown	.37
Male	.27
Manual	1.61
Moore	1.07
Pleasure Ridge	2.14
Seneca	.22
Shawnee	.71
Southern	2.63
Stuart	4.45
Valley	.57
Waggener	.24
Western	.35
Westport	1.21
County $\overline{X}$	1.00

*(% Suspension/$\overline{X}$ Suspension) (% Difference/$\overline{X}$ Difference)

Table 6

Suspension Rates

School	1974-1975		1975-1976		1976-1977	
	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White
Atherton	0	0	29.8	3.6	33.1	7.9
Ahrens	58.1	23.2	23.2	12.3	49.9	22.6
Ballard	4.2	6.9	171.1	15.5	114.8	17.2
Butler	21.2	8.8	91.7	7.9	68.2	8.4
Central	6.3	0	27.5	12.2	57.4	17.3
Doss	11.1	2.5	17.8	1.7	30.5	4.3
Durrett	10.0	3.8	114.5	27.6	93.3	25.9
Eastern	53.1	30.5	107.7	34.7	86.2	18.3
Fairdale	0	6.3	39.7	6.7	53.6	5.1
Fern Creek	20.8	21.7	109.2	17.7	137.5	28.9
Iroquois	25.0	14.6	132.8	2.8	35.2	19.4
Thomas Jefferson	29.4	9.4	37.4	14.5	40.6	15.3
Jeffersontown	10.0	10.7	40.7	12.7	43.5	6.9
Male	22.9	0	46.9	25.8	40.8	28.8
Manual	48.4	23.5	64.5	18.9	75.4	17.1
Moore	10.0	13.8	51.8	13.6	70.9	15.0
Pleasure Ridge	0	2.4	58.9	14.8	97.6	23.9
Seneca	13.7	9.3	57.2	23.5	31.5	8.6
Shawnee	13.4	0	21.4	7.2	52.7	16.1
Southern	0	2.6	81.9	16.9	108.8	33.6
Stuart	0	2.9	55.8	10.9	144.1	25.1
Valley	12.9	7.6	93.1	26.7	50.2	12.2
Waggener	33.3	7.4	78.6	10.1	34.8	5.6
Western	0	2.0	45.9	8.4	40.2	6.4
Westport	11.4	10.5	88.8	14.5	74.9	11.9
County $\overline{X}$	23.1	8.0	65.5	15.3	65.3	16.3
City $\overline{X}$	22.9	8.8	NA	NA	NA	NA

Table
Student Suspension by Ethnicity and Grade Level for School Year 1976-1977
Totals for All Schools

FIRST QUARTER

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	2,987	1,153	38.6	9,307	677	9.4	12,337	2,030	16.5
10	2,033	540	26.6	7,786	430	5.5	9,864	970	9.8
11	2,154	507	23.5	7,510	371	4.9	9,707	878	9.0
12	1,365	183	13.4	6,283	181	2.9	7,672	364	4.7
Total	8,539	2,386	27.9	30,886	1,859	6.0	39,580	4,242	10.7

Individual Students Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	2,987	796	26.6	9,307	730	7.8	12,337	1,526	12.4
10	2,033	401	19.7	7,786	365	4.7	9,864	766	7.8
11	2,154	371	17.2	7,510	327	4.4	9,707	698	7.2
12	1,365	138	10.1	6,283	164	2.6	7,672	302	3.9
Total	8,539	1,706	19.9	30,886	1,586	5.1	39,580	3,292	8.3

SECOND QUARTER

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	2,987	751	25.1	9,307	709	7.6	12,294	1,460	11.9
10	2,033	366	18.0	7,786	325	4.2	9,819	691	7.1
11	2,154	288	13.4	7,510	249	3.3	9,664	537	5.6
12	1,365	137	10.1	6,283	178	2.8	7,648	315	4.1
Total	8,539	1,542	18.1	30,886	1,461	4.7	39,425	3,003	7.6

Individual Students not Previously Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	2,987	513	17.2	9,037	542	5.9	12,294	1,055	8.6
10	2,033	246	12.1	7,786	253	3.2	9,819	499	5.1
11	2,154	182	8.4	7,510	213	2.8	9,664	395	2.9
12	1,365	99	7.3	6,283	150	2.4	7,648	249	3.3
Total	8,539	1,040	12.2	30,886	1,158	3.7	39,425	2,198	5.6

THIRD QUARTER

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	2,987	820	27.5	9,307	843	9.1	12,294	1,663	13.5
10	2,033	460	22.6	7,786	416	5.3	9,819	876	8.9
11	2,154	284	13.2	7,510	342	4.6	9,664	626	6.5
12	1,365	81	5.9	6,283	96	1.5	7,648	177	2.3
Total	8,539	1,645	19.3	30,886	1,697	5.5	39,425	3,342	8.5

Individual Students Not Previously Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	2,987	506	16.9	9,307	560	6.0	12,294	1,066	8.7
10	2,033	256	12.6	7,786	320	4.1	9,819	576	5.9
11	2,154	169	7.8	7,510	257	3.4	9,664	426	4.4
12	1,365	62	4.5	6,283	81	1.3	7,648	143	1.9
Total	8,539	993	11.6	30,886	121	3.9	39,425	1,114	5.6

TOTALS FOR 1976-1977 SCHOOL YEAR

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	2,987	2,723	91.2	9,307	2,428	26.1	12,294	5,151	41.9
10	2,033	1,366	67.2	7,786	1,171	15.1	9,819	2,537	25.9
11	2,154	1,079	50.1	7,510	962	12.8	9,664	2,041	21.2
12	1,365	401	29.4	6,283	455	7.2	7,648	856	11.2
Total	8,539	5,569	65.2	30,886	5,023	16.3	39,425	10,585	26.9

Individual Students Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	2,987	1,815	60.8	9,307	1,832	19.7	12,294	3,647	29.7
10	2,033	903	44.4	7,786	938	12.0	9,819	1,841	18.7
11	2,154	722	33.6	7,510	797	10.6	9,664	1,519	15.7
12	1,365	299	21.9	6,283	395	6.3	7,648	694	9.1
Total	8,539	3,739	43.8	30,886	3,962	12.8	39,425	7,701	19.5

Table 8
Student Suspension by Ethnicity and Offense for School Year 1976-1977
Totals for all Schools

Offense	BLACK								WHITE								TOTAL	
	1st Qtr.		2nd Qtr.		3rd Qtr.		Total		1st Qtr.		2nd Qtr.		3rd Qtr.		Total			
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
1. Arson	1	0	7	.5	8	.5	16	.3	5	.3	2	.1	2	.1	9	.2	25	.2
2. Assault on Staff	27	1.2	27	1.8	18	1.1	72	1.3	5	.3	4	.3	10	.6	19	.4	91	.9
3. Assault on Student	51	2.2	20	1.3	20	1.2	91	1.6	14	.7	11	.8	2	.1	27	.5	118	1.1
4. Burglary/Theft	63	2.7	32	2.1	30	1.9	125	2.2	10	.5	16	1.1	10	.6	36	.7	160	1.5
5. Bus Conduct	14	.6	24	1.6	5	.3	43	.8	4	.2	7	.5	2	.1	13	.3	56	.5
6. Destruction of property	10	.4	3	.2	10	.6	23	.4	9	.5	7	.5	8	.5	24	.5	47	.4
7. Disruption/Disobedience (classroom)	385	16.8	245	15.9	209	12.8	839	15.1	130	7.0	101	6.9	143	8.4	374	7.5	1213	11.5
8. Disruption/Disobedience (non-classroom)	251	10.9	206	13.4	215	13.1	672	12.1	173	9.3	176	12.0	181	10.7	530	10.5	1202	11.4
9. Disruption/Disobedience (ex. curr. act.)	4	.1	6	.4	4	.2	14	.3	3	.2	7	.5	6	.4	16	.3	30	.3
10. Excessive cutting of class	531	23.2	445	28.8	575	34.9	1551	27.9	632	34.1	562	38.4	754	44.4	1948	38.7	3499	33.2
11. Extortion	35	1.5	13	.8	6	.4	54	.9	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	55	.5
12. Excessive tardiness (class)	323	14.1	147	9.4	119	7.2	589	10.6	216	11.6	101	6.9	113	6.7	430	8.6	1019	9.6
13. Excessive tardiness (school)	38	1.6	33	2.1	54	3.3	125	2.2	34	1.8	67	4.6	115	6.8	216	4.3	341	3.2
14. Fighting	212	9.3	146	9.5	141	8.6	499	8.9	152	8.2	99	6.8	103	6.1	354	7.1	853	8.2
15. Gambling	6	.1	3	.2	4	.2	13	.2	2	.1	1	.1	2	.1	5	.1	18	.2
16. Indecent Exposure	0	0	1	.1	1	.1	2	0	1	0	0	0	2	.1	3	.1	5	0
17. Loitering/Trespassing	83	3.6	39	2.5	54	3.3	176	3.2	36	1.9	29	1.9	14	.8	79	1.6	255	2.4
18. Possession of alcoholic beverages	17	.7	6	.4	9	.5	32	.6	20	1.1	13	.9	12	.7	45	.9	77	.7
19 Possession or selling of drugs	37	1.6	23	1.5	27	1.6	87	1.6	63	3.4	64	4.4	41	2.4	168	3.3	255	2.4
20. Possession of explosives or fireworks	1	0	0	0	2	.1	3	.1	0	0	2	.1	7	.4	9	.2	12	.1
21. Possession of weapons	6	.1	3	.2	3	.2	12	.2	4	.2	10	.7	2	.1	16	.3	28	.3
22. Profanity or vulgarity	102	4.4	43	2.8	63	3.8	208	3.7	35	1.8	21	1.4	25	1.5	81	1.6	289	2.7
23. Selling goods illegally	1	0	0	0	1	.1	2	0	0	0	1	.1	0	0	1	0	3	0
24. Smoking in unassigned area	91	3.9	61	3.9	42	2.6	194	3.5	111	5.9	128	8.8	100	5.9	339	6.8	533	5.0
25. Truancy (over 16 yrs. of age)	15	.6	5	.3	7	.4	27	.5	13	.7	13	.9	15	.9	41	.8	68	.6
26. Walkout participation	50	2.2	0	0	8	.5	58	1.0	185	9.9	18	1.2	26	1.5	229	4.6	287	2.7
27. Violation of dress code	30	1.3	4	.3	9	.5	43	.8	1	0	1	.1	1	.1	3	.1	46	.4
TOTALS	2386	100%	1542	100%	1644	100%	5569	100%	1859	100%	1461	100%	1696	100%	5016	100%	10585	100%

Student Suspension by Ethnicity and Grade Level for School Year 1976-1977

Atherton High School

FIRST QUARTER

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	108	10	9.3	320	15	4.7	428	25	5.8
10	77	25	32.5	307	18	5.8	384	43	11.1
11	84	7	8.4	323	18	5.6	407	25	6.1
12	52	4	7.7	276	3	1.1	328	7	2.1
Total	321	46	14.3	1,226	54	4.4	1,547	100	6.4

Individual Students Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	108	10	9.3	320	15	4.7	428	25	5.8
10	77	17	22.1	307	18	5.8	384	35	6.4
11	84	5	5.9	323	17	5.3	407	22	5.4
12	52	3	5.8	276	3	1.1	328	6	1.8
Total	321	35	10.9	1,226	53	4.3	1,547	88	5.6

SECOND QUARTER

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	108	13	12.1	320	4	1.3	428	17	3.9
10	77	11	14.3	307	14	4.7	384	25	6.4
11	84	4	4.8	323	4	1.2	407	8	1.9
12	52	2	3.8	276	2	.7	328	4	1.2
Total	321	30	9.3	1,226	24	1.9	1,547	54	3.5

Individual Students not Previously Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	108	12	11.1	320	4	1.3	428	16	3.7
10	77	9	11.7	307	14	4.7	384	23	5.9
11	84	4	4.8	323	4	1.2	407	8	1.9
12	52	2	3.8	276	2	.7	328	4	1.2
Total	321	27	8.4	1,226	24	1.9	1,547	51	3.3

THIRD QUARTER

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	108	15	13.9	320	4	1.3	428	19	4.4
10	77	6	[illegible]	307	7	2.3	384	13	3.4
11	84	7	8.3	323	4	1.2	407	11	2.7
12	52	2	3.8	276	4	1.4	328	6	1.8
Total	321	30	9.3	1,226	19	1.5	1,547	49	3.2

Individual Students Not Previously Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	108	15	13.9	320	4	1.3	428	19	4.4
10	77	4	5.2	307	4	1.3	384	8	2.1
11	84	6	7.1	323	4	1.2	407	10	2.5
12	52	2	3.8	276	4	1.4	328	6	1.8
Total	321	27	8.4	1,226	16	1.3	1,547	43	2.8

TOTALS FOR 1976-1977 SCHOOL YEAR

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	108	38	35.2	320	23	7.2	428	61	14.3
10	77	42	54.5	307	39	12.7	384	81	21.0
11	84	18	21.4	323	26	8.0	407	44	10.8
12	52	8	15.4	276	9	3.3	328	17	5.2
Total	321	106	33.1	1,226	97	7.9	1,547	203	13.1

Individual Students Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	108	37	34.3	320	23	7.2	428	60	14.0
10	77	30	38.9	307	36	11.7	384	66	17.2
11	84	15	17.9	323	25	7.7	407	40	9.8
12	52	7	13.5	276	9	3.3	328	16	4.9
Total	321	89	27.7	1,226	93	7.6	1,547	182	11.8

Table 10
Student Suspension by Ethnicity and Offense for School Year 1976-1977
Atherton High

	BLACK								WHITE								TOTAL	
	1st Qtr.		2nd Qtr.		3rd Qtr.		Total		1st Qtr.		2nd Qtr.		3rd Qtr.		Total			
Offense	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
1. Arson	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2. Assault on Staff	1	2.2	0	0	0	0	1	.9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	.5
3. Assault on Student	1	2.2	0	0	1	3.3	2	1.9	1	1.8	0	0	0	0	1	1.0	3	1.5
4. Burglary/Theft	4	8.7	5	16.7	0	0	9	8.5	0	0	3	12.5	0	0	3	3.1	12	6.0
5. Bus Conduct	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6. Destruction of property	0	0	0	0	1	3.3	1	.9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	.5
7. Disruption/Disobedience (classroom)	5	10.8	7	23.4	2	6.7	14	13.2	6	11.1	3	12.5	3	15.8	12	12.4	26	12.8
8. Disruption/Disobedience (non-classroom)	7	15.3	10	33.3	1	3.3	18	17.0	2	3.7	14	58.3	4	21.1	20	20.6	38	18.7
9. Disruption/Disobedience (ex. curr. act.)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10. Excessive cutting of class	15	32.6	4	13.3	13	43.4	32	30.3	29	53.8	4	16.7	5	26.3	38	39.2	70	34.4
11. Extortion	3	6.5	0	0	0	0	3	2.8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1.5
12. Excessive tardiness (class)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
13. Excessive tardiness (school)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
14. Fighting	5	10.8	0	0	5	16.7	10	9.4	3	5.5	0	0	0	0	3	3.1	13	6.3
15. Gambling	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
16. Indecent Exposure	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
17. Loitering/Trespassing	0	0	2	6.7	0	0	2	1.9	0	0	0	0	1	5.3	1	1.0	3	1.5
18. Possession of alcoholic beverages	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
19 Possession or selling of drugs	1	2.2	1	3.3	1	3.3	3	2.8	9	16.8	0	0	0	0	9	9.3	12	6.0
20. Possession of explosives or fireworks	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Possession of weapons	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Profanity or vulgarity	1	2.2	0	0	1	3.3	2	1.9	1	1.8	0	0	0	0	1	1.0	3	1.5
23. Selling goods illegally	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
24. Smoking in unassigned area	3	6.5	1	3.3	5	16.7	9	8.5	3	5.5	0	0	6	31.5	9	9.3	18	8.8
25. Truancy (over 16 yrs. of age)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
26. Walkout participation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
27. Violation of dress code	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
114 TOTALS	46	100%	30	100%	30	100%	106	100%	54	100%	24	100%	19	100%	97	100%	202	100%

[redacted]

115

Table 11

Student Suspension by Ethnicity and Grade Level for School Year 1976-1977

Ahrens High School

FIRST QUARTER

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	130	25	19.2	441	50	11.3	571	75	13.1
10	107	11	10.3	309	11	3.6	416	22	5.3
11	106	7	6.6	208	8	3.8	314	15	4.8
12	66	1	1.5	129	6	4.7	195	7	3.6
Total	409	44	10.7	1,087	75	6.9	1,496	119	7.9

Individual Students Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	130	23	17.7	441	46	10.4	571	69	12.1
10	107	10	9.3	309	10	3.2	416	20	4.8
11	106	6	5.7	208	6	2.9	314	12	3.8
12	66	1	1.5	129	6	4.7	195	7	3.6
Total	409	40	9.7	1,087	68	6.2	1,496	108	7.2

SECOND QUARTER

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	130	65	50.0	441	101	22.9	571	166	29.1
10	107	29	27.1	309	14	4.5	416	43	10.3
11	106	10	9.4	208	7	3.4	314	17	5.4
12	66	3	4.5	129	1	.8	195	4	2.1
Total	409	107	26.2	1,087	123	11.3	1,496	230	15.4

Individual Students Not Previously-Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	130	53	40.8	441	85	19.3	571	138	24.1
10	107	25	23.4	309	13	4.2	416	38	9.1
11	106	10	9.4	208	7	3.4	314	17	5.4
12	66	3	4.5	129	1	.8	195	4	2.1
Total	409	91	22.3	1,087	106	9.8	1,496	197	13.2

THIRD QUARTER

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	130	22	16.9	441	37	8.4	571	59	10.3
10	107	18	16[illegible]	309	8	2.6	416	26	6.3
11	106	8	7.5	208	3	1.4	314	11	3.5
12	66	5	7.6	129	0	0	195	5	2.6
Total	409	53	12.9	1,087	48	4.4	1,496	101	6.8

Individual Students Not Previously Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	130	17	13.1	441	33	7.5	571	50	8.8
10	107	17	15.9	309	8	2.6	416	25	6.0
11	106	6	5.7	208	2	.9	314	8	2.5
12	66	4	6.1	129	0	0	195	4	2.1
Total	409	44	10.8	1,087	43	3.9	1,496	87	5.8

TOTALS FOR 1976-1977 SCHOOL YEAR

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	130	112	86.2	441	188	42.6	571	300	52.5
10	107	58	54.2	309	33	10.7	416	91	21.9
11	106	25	23.6	208	18	8.7	314	43	13.7
12	66	9	13.6	129	7	5.4	195	16	8.2
Total	409	204	49.9	1,087	246	22.6	1,496	450	30.1

Individual Students Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	130	93	71.5	441	164	37.2	571	257	45.0
10	107	52	48.6	309	31	10.0	416	83	19.9
11	106	22	20.8	208	15	7.2	314	37	11.8
12	66	8	12.1	129	7	5.4	195	15	7.7
Total	409	175	42.8	1,087	217	20.0	1,496	392	26.2

Table 12
Student Suspension by Ethnicity and Offense for School Year 1976-1977
Ahrens High

Offense	BLACK 1st Qtr. #	%	2nd Qtr. #	%	3rd Qtr. #	%	Total #	%	WHITE 1st Qtr. #	%	2nd Qtr. #	%	3rd Qtr. #	%	Total #	%	TOTAL #	%
1. Arson	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2. Assault on Staff	1	2.3	2	1.9	0	0	3	1.5	0	0	1	.8	0	0	1	.4	4	.9
3. Assault on Student	0	0	2	1.9	0	0	2	.9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	.4
4. Burglary/Theft	0	0	1	.9	0	0	1	.5	1	1.4	0	0	0	0	1	.4	2	.4
5. Bus Conduct	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6. Destruction of property	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7. Disruption/Disobedience (classroom)	11	25.0	17	15.8	5	9.4	33	16.2	5	6.6	6	4.9	7	14.6	18	7.3	51	11.3
8. Disruption/Disobedience (non-classroom)	3	6.8	13	12.1	0	0	16	7.8	2	2.7	6	4.9	0	0	8	3.3	24	5.4
9. Disruption/Disobedience (ex. curr. act.)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10. Excessive cutting of class	10	22.7	51	47.7	31	58.5	92	45.1	28	37.3	97	78.9	24	50.0	149	60.6	241	53.6
11. Extortion	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
12. Excessive tardiness (class)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
13. Excessive tardiness (school)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
14. Fighting	16	36.3	14	13.1	11	20.8	41	20.2	31	41.3	7	5.6	11	22.8	49	19.9	90	20.0
15. Gambling	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2.7	0	0	2	4.2	4	1.6	4	.9
16. Indecent Exposure	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
17. Loitering/Trespassing	1	2.3	0	0	2	3.8	3	1.5	0	0	0	0	2	4.2	2	.8	5	1.1
18. Possession of alcoholic beverages	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2.1	1	.4	1	.2
19 Possession or selling of drugs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
20. Possession of explosives or fireworks	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Possession of weapons	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Profanity or vulgarity	1	2.3	2	1.9	3	5.7	6	2.9	2	2.7	0	0	0	0	2	.8	8	1.8
23. Selling goods illegally	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
24. Smoking in unassigned area	1	2.3	5	4.7	1	1.8	7	3.4	4	5.3	6	4.9	1	2.1	11	4.5	18	4.0
25. Truancy (over 16 yrs. of age)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
26. Walkout participation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
27. Violation of dress code	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTALS	44	100%	107	100%	53	100%	204	100%	75	100%	123	100%	48	100%	246	100%	450	100%

[redacted]ble[redacted]

Student Suspension by Ethnicity and Grade level for School Year 1976-1977
Ballard High School

FIRST QUARTER

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	121	152	125.6	320	46	14.4	441	198	44.7
10	55	43	78.2	335	29	8.7	390	72	18.4
11	106	63	59.4	357	41	11.5	463	104	22.1
12	50	23	46.0	342	19	5.6	392	42	10.6
Total	332	281	84.6	1.354	135	9.9	1,686	416	24.4

Individual Students Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	121	82	67.8	320	30	9.4	441	112	25.3
10	55	27	49.1	335	19	5.7	390	46	11.7
11	106	43	40.6	357	35	9.8	463	78	16.8
12	50	18	36.0	342	14	4.1	392	32	8.1
Total	332	170	51.2	1,354	98	7.2	1,686	268	15.7

SECOND QUARTER

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	121	16	13.2	320	10	3.1	441	26	5.9
10	55	7	12.7	335	10	2.9	390	17	4.3
11	106	20	18.9	357	18	5.1	463	38	8.1
12	50	1	2.0	342	7	2.1	392	8	2.1
Total	332	44	13.3	1,354	45	3.3	1,686	89	5.2

Individual Students Not Previously Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	121	9	7.4	320	6	1.8	441	15	3.4
10	55	4	7.3	335	5	1.5	390	9	2.3
11	106	3	2.8	357	8	2.2	463	11	2.3
12	50	1	2.0	342	4	1.2	392	5	1.3
Total	332	17	5.1	1,354	23	1.7	1,686	40	2.4

THIRD QUARTER

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	121	21	17.4	320	14	4.4	441	35	7.9
10	55	12	21.8	335	15	4.5	390	27	6.9
11	106	17	16.0	357	22	6.2	463	39	8.4
12	50	6	12.0	342	2	.6	392	8	2.0
Total	332	56	16.9	1,354	53	3.9	1,686	109	6.5

Individual Students Not Previously Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	121	12	9.9	320	9	2.8	441	21	4.8
10	55	5	9.1	335	10	2.9	390	15	3.8
11	106	4	3.8	357	13	3.6	463	17	3.7
12	50	3	6.0	342	2	.6	392	5	1.3
Total	332	24	7.2	1,354	34	2.5	1,686	58	3.4

TOTALS FOR 1976-1977 SCHOOL YEAR

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	121	189	56.1	320	70	21.9	441	259	58.7
10	55	62	12.7	335	54	16.1	390	116	29.7
11	106	100	94.3	357	81	22.7	463	181	39.1
12	50	30	60.0	342	28	8.2	392	58	14.8
Total	332	381	14.8	1,354	233	17.2	1,686	614	36.4

Individual Students Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	121	103	85.1	320	45	14.1	441	148	33.6
10	55	36	65.5	335	34	10.1	390	70	17.9
11	106	50	47.2	387	56	15.7	463	106	22.9
12	50	22	44.0	342	20	5.8	392	42	10.7
Total	332	211	63.5	1,354	155	11.4	1,686	366	21.7

Table 14
Student Suspension by Ethnicity and Offense for School Year 1976-1977
Ballard High School

Offense	BLACK								WHITE								TOTAL	
	1st Qtr.		2nd Qtr.		3rd Qtr.		Total		1st Qtr.		2nd Qtr.		3rd Qtr.		Total			
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
1. Arson	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2. Assault on Staff	2	.8	1	2.3	3	5.0	6	1.6	0	0	0	0	3	5.6	3	1.3	9	1.5
3. Assault on Student	5	2.0	1	2.3	2	4.0	8	2.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	1.3
4. Burglary/Theft	5	2.0	3	6.8	1	2.0	9	2.4	0	0	0	0	1	1.9	1	.4	10	1.6
5. Bus Conduct	1	.4	6	13.6	0	0	7	1.9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	1.1
6. Destruction of property	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1.5	0	0	0	0	2	.9	2	.3
7. Disruption/Disobedience (classroom)	41	15.0	13	29.5	7	13.0	61	16.0	2	1.5	3	6.7	4	7.5	9	3.9	70	11.4
8. Disruption/Disobedience (non-classroom)	29	10.0	7	15.9	17	30.0	53	13.9	31	22.9	27	60.0	30	56.7	88	37.8	141	23.0
9. Disruption/Disobedience (ex. curr. act.)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10. Excessive cutting of class	45	16.0	5	9.0	55	14.4	30	22.3	30	22.3	3	6.7	8	15.1	41	17.7	96	15.6
11. Extortion	5	2.0	0	0	1	2.0	6	1.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	1.0
12. Excessive tardiness (class)	67	23.8	1	2.3	4	7.0	72	18.9	33	24.5	3	6.7	2	3.8	38	16.3	110	17.9
13. Excessive tardiness (school)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2.2	0	0	1	.4	1	.2
14. Fighting	11	3.0	0	0	4	7.0	15	3.9	1	.7	0	0	0	0	1	.4	16	2.6
15. Gambling	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
16. Indecent exposure	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
17. Loitering/Trespassing	4	1.4	0	0	0	0	4	1.1	0	0	1	2.2	0	0	1	.4	5	.8
18. Possession of alcoholic beverages	1	.4	0	0	2	4.0	3	.8	0	0	0	0	1	1.9	1	.4	4	.7
19 Possession or selling of drugs	10	4.0	4	9.1	3	5.0	17	4.5	8	5.9	6	13.3	1	1.9	15	6.4	32	5.2
20. Possession of explosives or fireworks	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Possession of weapons	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Profanity or vulgarity	15	5.0	2	4.5	3	5.0	20	5.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	3.2
23. Selling goods illegally	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
24. Smoking in unassigned area	12	4.3	1	2.3	3	5.0	16	4.2	3	2.2	1	2.2	3	5.6	7	3.0	23	3.8
25. Truancy (over 16 yrs. of age)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
26. Walkout participation	4	1.4	0	0	0	0	4	1.0	24	17.8	0	0	0	0	24	10.3	28	4.6
27. Violation of dress code	24	8.5	0	0	1	2.0	25	6.5	1	.7	0	0	0	0	1	.4	26	4.2
TOTALS	281	100%	44	100%	56	100%	381	100%	135	100%	45	100%	53	100%	233	100%	614	100%

Table 15
Student Suspension by Ethnicity and Grade Level for School Year 1976-1977
Butler High School

FIRST QUARTER

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	214	61	28.5	349	6	1.7	563	67	11.9
10	112	25	22.3	320	5	1.6	432	30	6.9
11	122	39	31.9	327	18	5.5	449	57	12.6
12	58	15	25.9	275	8	2.9	333	23	6.9
Total	506	140	27.7	1,271	37	2.9	1,777	177	24.8

Individual Students Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	214	47	21.9	349	6	1.7	563	53	9.4
10	112	21	18.8	320	4	1.3	432	25	5.8
11	122	29	23.8	327	17	5.2	449	46	10.2
12	58	12	20.7	275	6	2.2	333	18	5.4
Total	506	109	21.6	1,271	33	2.6	1,777	142	7.9

SECOND QUARTER

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	214	57	26.6	349	9	2.6	563	66	11.7
10	112	16	14.3	320	8	2.5	432	24	5.5
11	122	29	23.7	327	19	5.8	449	48	10.6
12	58	8	13.8	275	4	1.4	333	12	3.6
Total	506	110	21.6	1,271	40	3.2	1,777	150	8.4

Individual Students Not Previously Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	214	39	18.2	349	5	1.4	563	44	7.8
10	112	13	11.6	320	7	2.2	432	20	4.6
11	122	23	18.8	327	19	5.8	449	42	9.3
12	58	7	12.1	275	4	1.4	333	11	3.3
Total	506	82	16.2	1,271	35	13.6	1,777	117	6.6

THIRD QUARTER

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	214	46	21.5	349	15	4.3	563	61	10.8
10	112	29	25.9	320	5	1.6	432	34	7.9
11	122	17	13.9	327	10	3.1	449	27	6.0
12	58	3	5.2	275	0	0	333	3	.9
Total	506	96	18.8	1,271	30	2.4	1,777	125	7.0

Individual Students Not Previously Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	214	35	16.4	349	8	2.3	563	43	7.6
10	112	20	17.9	320	4	1.3	432	24	5.6
11	122	14	11.5	327	10	3.1	449	24	5.3
12	58	3	5.2	275	0	0	333	3	.9
Total	506	72	14.2	1,271	22	1.7	1,777	94	5.3

TOTALS FOR 1976-1977 SCHOOL YEAR

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	214	164	76.6	349	30	8.6	563	194	34.5
10	112	70	62.5	320	18	5.6	432	88	20.4
11	122	85	69.7	327	47	14.4	449	132	29.4
12	58	26	44.8	275	12	4.4	333	38	11.4
Total	506	345	68.2	1,271	107	8.4	1,777	452	25.4

Individual Students Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	214	121	56.5	349	19	5.4	563	140	24.9
10	112	54	48.2	320	15	4.7	432	69	15.9
11	122	66	54.1	327	46	14.1	449	112	24.9
12	58	22	37.9	275	10	3.6	333	32	9.6
Total	506	263	52.0	1,271	90	7.1	1,777	353	19.9

Table 16
Student Suspension by Ethnicity and Offense for School Year 1976-1977

Butler High School

	BLACK								WHITE								TOTAL	
	1st Qtr.		2nd Qtr.		3rd Qtr.		Total		1st Qtr.		2nd Qtr.		3rd Qtr.		Total			
Offense	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
1. Arson	0	0	0	0	1	1.1	1	.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	.2
2. Assault on Staff	1	.7	2	1.8	0	0	3	.9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	.7
3. Assault on Student	2	1.4	0	0	1	1.1	3	.9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	.7
4. Burglary/Theft	0	0	1	.9	0	0	1	.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	.2
5. Bus Conduct	0	0	0	0	1	1.1	1	.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	.2
6. Destruction of property	1	.7	0	0	0	0	1	.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	.2
7. Disruption/Disobedience (classroom)	15	10.8	8	7.3	5	5.3	28	8.1	1	2.7	1	2.5	4	13.4	6	5.6	34	7.5
8. Disruption/Disobedience (non-classroom)	3	2.1	4	3.7	5	5.3	12	3.5	0	0	1	2.5	0	0	1	.9	13	2.9
9. Disruption/Disobedience (ex. curr. act.)	0	0	1	.9	0	0	1	.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	.2
10. Excessive cutting of class	61	43.7	59	53.6	49	51.4	169	48.6	21	48.6	21	52.5	21	52.5	21	70.0	229	50.7
11. Extortion	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
12. Excessive tardiness (class)	32	22.9	16	14.5	13	13.6	61	17.7	13	35.2	9	22.5	2	6.7	24	22.5	85	18.8
13. Excessive tardiness (school)	9	6.4	3	2.7	5	5.3	17	4.9	1	2.7	5	12.5	1	3.3	7	6.6	24	5.3
14. Fighting	7	5.0	7	6.4	3	3.2	17	4.9	2	5.4	1	2.5	1	3.3	4	3.7	21	4.6
15. Gambling	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
16. Indecent exposure	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
17. Loitering/Trespassing	3	2.1	0	0	0	0	3	.9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	.7
18. Possession of alcoholic beverages	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2.7	0	0	0	0	1	.9	1	.2
19 Possession or selling of drugs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
20. Possession of explosives or fireworks	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Possession of weapons	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Profanity or vulgarity	5	3.5	8	7.3	11	11.5	24	6.9	1	2.7	0	0	1	3.3	2	1.9	26	5.8
23. Selling goods illegally	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
24. Smoking in unassigned area	1	.7	1	.9	1	1.1	3	.9	0	0	1	2.5	0	0	1	.9	4	.9
25. Truancy (over 16 yrs. of age)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2.5	0	0	1	.9	1	.2
26. Walkout participation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
27. Violation of dress code	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTALS	140	100%	110	100%	95	100%	345	100%	37	100%	40	100%	30	100%	107	100%	452	100%

[illegible]e [illegible]

Student Suspension by Ethnicity and Grade Level for School Year 1976-1977

Central High School

FIRST QUARTER

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	119	51	42.8	351	37	10.5	470	88	18.7
10	76	19	25.0	323	15	4.6	399	34	8.5
11	107	10	9.3	336	6	1.8	443	16	3.6
12	62	6	9.7	287	7	2.4	349	13	3.7
Total	364	88	23.6	1,297	65	5.1	1,661	151	18.5

Individual Students Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	119	36	30.3	351	35	9.9	470	71	15.1
10	76	14	18.4	323	14	4.3	399	28	7.0
11	107	8	7.5	336	6	1.8	443	14	3.2
12	62	5	8.1	287	7	2.4	349	12	3.4
Total	364	63	17.3	1,297	66	4.9	1,661	125	7.5

SECOND QUARTER

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	119	49	41.2	351	41	11.7	470	90	19.1
10	76	7	9.2	323	21	6.5	399	28	7.0
11	107	12	11.2	336	11	3.3	443	23	5.2
12	62	7	17.7	287	21	7.3	349	28	8.1
Total	364	75	20.6	1,297	94	7.2	1,661	169	10.2

Individual Students Not Previously Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	119	35	29.4	361	36	10.3	470	71	15.1
10	76	7	9.2	323	16	4.9	399	23	5.7
11	107	7	6.5	336	10	2.9	443	17	3.8
12	62	6	9.7	287	19	6.6	349	25	7.2
Total	364	55	15.1	1,297	81	6.2	1,661	136	8.2

THIRD QUARTER

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	119	33	27.7	351	41	11.7	470	74	15.7
10	76	7	9.2	323	9	2.8	399	16	4.0
11	107	7	6.5	336	15	4.5	443	22	4.9
12	62	1	1.6	287	1	.3	349	2	.6
Total	364	48	13.2	1,297	66	5.1	1,661	114	6.9

Individual Students Not Previously Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	119	24	20.2	351	33	9.4	470	57	12.1
10	76	5	6.6	323	8	2.5	399	13	3.3
11	107	4	3.7	336	14	4.2	443	18	4.1
12	62	1	1.6	287	1	.3	349	2	.6
Total	364	34	9.3	1,297	56	4.3	1,661	90	5.4

TOTALS FOR 1976-1977 SCHOOL YEAR

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	119	133	111.7	351	119	33.9	470	252	53.6
10	76	33	43.4	323	45	13.9	399	78	19.5
11	107	29	27.1	336	32	9.5	443	61	13.8
12	62	14	22.6	287	29	10.1	349	43	12.3
Total	364	209	57.4	1,297	225	17.3	1,661	434	26.1

Individual Students Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	119	95	79.8	351	104	29.6	470	199	42.3
10	76	26	34.2	323	30	11.6	399	64	16.0
11	107	19	17.8	336	30	8.9	443	49	11.1
12	62	12	19.4	287	27	9.4	349	39	11.2
Total	364	152	41.8	1,297	199	15.3	1,661	351	21.1

Table 18
Student Suspension by Ethnicity and Offense for School Year 1976-1977
Central High School

	BLACK								WHITE								TOTAL	
	1st Qtr.		2nd Qtr.		3rd Qtr.		Total		1st Qtr.		2nd Qtr.		3rd Qtr.		Total			
Offense	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
1. Arson	0	0	0	0	3	6.3	3	1.4	1	1.5	0	0	0	0	1	.4	4	.9
2. Assault on Staff	0	0	1	1.3	0	0	1	.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	.2
3. Assault on Student	5	5.8	3	4.0	0	0	8	3.8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	1.8
4. Burglary/Theft	3	3.5	0	0	0	0	3	1.4	0	0	3	3.2	0	0	3	1.4	6	1.4
5. Bus Conduct	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6. Destruction of property	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2.1	0	0	2	.9	2	.4
7. Disruption/Disobedience (classroom)	13	15.2	7	9.3	0	0	20	9.6	0	0	1	1.1	0	0	1	.4	21	4.8
8. Disruption/Disobedience (non-classroom)	2	2.3	11	14.8	3	6.3	16	7.7	9	13.9	17	18.1	11	16.7	37	16.4	53	12.1
9. Disruption/Disobedience (ex. curr. act.)	0	0	1	1.3	0	0	1	.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	.2
10. Excessive cutting of class	37	43.1	25	33.4	31	64.6	93	44.5	41	63.2	52	55.3	41	62.1	134	59.6	227	52.2
11. Extortion	1	1.1	3	4.0	0	0	4	1.9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	.9
12. Excessive tardiness (class)	13	15.1	6	8.0	5	10.4	24	11.5	3	4.6	7	7.4	6	9.2	16	7.1	40	9.2
13. Excessive tardiness (school)	0	0	1	1.3	0	0	1	.5	0	0	1	1.1	0	0	1	.4	2	.4
14. Fighting	4	4.6	4	5.3	1	2.1	9	4.3	1	1.5	1	1.1	1	1.5	3	1.4	12	2.9
15. Gambling	0	0	1	1.3	0	0	1	1.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	.2
16. Indecent exposure	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
17. Loitering/Trespassing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
18. Possession of alcoholic beverages	0	0	0	0	1	2.1	1	.5	0	0	2	2.1	0	0	2	.9	3	.7
19 Possession or selling of drugs	0	0	3	4.0	0	0	3	1.4	5	7.7	4	4.3	1	1.5	10	4.4	13	2.9
20. Possession of explosives or fireworks	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Possession of weapons	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1.5	0	0	0	0	1	.4	1	.2
22. Profanity or vulgarity	5	5.8	1	1.3	2	4.1	8	3.8	0	0	2	2.1	1	1.5	3	1.4	11	2.5
23. Selling goods illegally	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
24. Smoking in unassigned area	3	3.5	8	10.7	2	4.1	13	6.2	4	6.1	2	2.1	3	4.5	9	4.0	22	5.7
25. Truancy (over 16 yrs. of age)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3.0	2	.9	2	.4
26. Walkout participation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
27. Violation of dress code	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTALS	86	100	75	100	48	100	209	100	65	100	94	100	66	100	225	100	434	100

Table [illegible]

Student Suspension by Ethnicity and Grade Level for School Year 1976-1977

Doss High School

FIRST QUARTER

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	102	17	16.7	267	7	2.6	369	24	6.5
10	47	6	12.8	252	6	2.4	299	12	4.0
11	77	19	24.7	271	4	1.5	348	23	6.6
12	40	1	2.5	265	0	0.0	305	1	0.3
Total	266	43	16.2	1,055	17	1.6	1,321	60	4.5

Individual Students Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	102	14	13.7	267	5	1.9	369	19	5.1
10	47	5	10.6	252	5	1.9	299	10	3.3
11	77	16	20.8	271	4	1.5	348	21	6.1
12	40	1	2.5	265	0	0.0	305	1	0.3
Total	266	36	13.5	1,055	14	1.3	1,321	50	3.8

SECOND QUARTER

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	102	15	14.7	267	5	1.9	369	20	5.4
10	47	2	4.3	252	4	1.6	299	6	2.0
11	77	5	6.5	271	2	.7	348	7	2.0
12	40	1	2.5	266	2	.7	304	3	.9
Total	266	23	8.6	1,055	13	1.2	1,321	36	2.7

Individual Students Not Previously Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	102	12	11.8	267	5	1.9	369	17	4.6
10	47	2	4.3	252	3	1.2	299	5	1.6
11	77	3	3.9	271	2	.7	348	5	1.4
12	40	1	2.5	265	1	.4	305	2	.6
Total	266	18	6.8	1,055	11	1.1	1,321	29	2.2

THIRD QUARTER

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	102	8	7.8	267	10	3.7	369	18	4.9
10	47	1	2.1	252	4	1.6	299	5	1.7
11	77	4	5.2	271	1	.4	348	5	1.4
12	40	2	5.0	265	0	0	305	2	.7
Total	266	15	5.6	1,055	15	1.4	1,321	30	2.3

Individual Students Not Previously Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	102	6	5.9	267	8	2.9	369	14	3.8
10	47	1	2.1	252	3	1.2	299	4	1.3
11	77	4	5.2	271	1	.4	348	5	1.4
12	40	2	5.0	265	0	0	305	2	.7
Total	266	13	4.9	1,055	12	1.1	1,321	25	1.9

TOTALS FOR 1976-1977 SCHOOL YEAR

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	102	40	39.2	267	22	8.2	369	62	16.8
10	47	9	19.1	252	14	5.6	299	23	7.7
11	77	28	36.4	271	7	2.6	348	35	10.1
12	40	4	10.0	265	2	.8	305	6	1.9
Total	266	81	30.5	1,055	45	4.3	1,321	126	9.5

Individual Students Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	102	32	31.4	267	18	6.7	369	50	13.6
10	47	8	17.0	252	11	4.4	299	19	6.4
11	77	23	31.2	271	7	2.6	348	30	8.9
12	40	4	7.5	265	1	.4	305	5	1.3
Total	266	67	25.2	1,055	37	3.5	1,321	104	7.9

Table 20

Student Suspension by Ethnicity and Offense for School Year 1976-1977

Doss High School

	BLACK								WHITE								TOTAL	
	1st Qtr.		2nd Qtr.		3rd Qtr.		Total		1st Qtr.		2nd Qtr.		3rd Qtr.		Total			
Offense	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
1. Arson	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2. Assault on Staff	1	2.3	1	4.3	0	0	2	2.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1.6
3. Assault on Student	1	2.3	0	0	0	0	1	1.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	.8
4. Burglary/Theft	4	9.3	1	4.3	0	0	5	6.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	3.9
5. Bus Conduct	1	2.3	0	0	0	0	1	1.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	.8
6. Destruction of property	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7. Disruption/Disobedience (classroom)	4	9.3	7	30.4	2	13.3	13	16.0	3	17.6	1	7.7	2	13.3	6	13.4	19	15.1
8. Disruption/Disobedience (non-classroom)	2	4.7	0	0	2	13.3	4	4.9	3	17.6	0	0	0	0	3	6.7	7	5.5
9. Disruption/Disobedience (ex. curr. act.)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10. Excessive cutting of class	0	0	4	17.5	3	20.0	7	8.7	4	23.5	4	30.7	7	46.7	15	33.4	2.2	17.5
11. Extortion	2	4.7	0	0	0	0	2	2.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1.6
12. Excessive tardiness (class)	0	0	1	4.3	0	0	1	1.2	1	5.9	1	7.7	1	6.7	3	6.7	4	3.2
13. Excessive tardiness (school)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	11.8	0	0	0	0	2	4.4	2	1.6
14. Fighting	3	6.9	4	17.5	2	13.3	9	11.1	1	5.9	2	15.4	1	6.7	4	8.8	13	10.3
15. Gambling	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
16. Indecent exposure	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
17. Loitering/Trespassing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.9	0	0	0	0	1	2.2	1	.8
18. Possession of alcoholic beverages	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.9	2	15.4	0	0	3	6.7	3	2.4
19 Possession or selling of drugs	1	2.3	0	0	4	26.7	5	6.2	1	5.9	0	0	4	26.6	5	11.1	10	7.9
20. Possession of explosives or fireworks	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Possession of weapons	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2.7	0	0	1	2.2	1	.8
22. Profanity or vulgarity	1	2.3	5	21.7	1	6.7	7	8.7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.5
23. Selling goods illegally	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
24. Smoking in unassigned area	1	2.3	0	0	0	0	1	1.2	0	0	1	7.7	0	0	1	2.2	2	1.6
25. Truancy (over 16 yrs. of age)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	7.7	0	0	1	2.2	1	.8
26. Walkout participation	22	51.3	0	0	0	0	22	27.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	17.5
27. Violation of dress code	0	0	0	0	1	6.7	1	1.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	.8
TOTALS [redacted]	[redacted]	100[redacted]	3	[redacted]%	[redacted]	100[redacted]	1	[redacted]%	[redacted]	100[redacted]	3	[redacted]%	[redacted]	100[redacted]	5	[redacted]	1[redacted]	100[redacted]

[redacted]ble[redacted]

Student Suspension by Ethnicity and Grade Level for School Year 1976-1977

Durrett High School

FIRST QUARTER

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	72	37	51.4	387	95	24.5	457	132	28.7
10	60	24	40.0	283	32	11.3	343	56	16.3
11	45	9	20.0	346	30	8.7	391	39	9.9
12	33	4	12.1	257	5	1.9	290	9	3.1
Total	210	74	35.2	1,273	162	12.5	1,483	236	15.9

Individual Students Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	72	26	36.1	387	74	19.1	457	100	21.7
10	60	20	33.3	283	25	8.8	343	45	13.1
11	45	6	13.3	346	23	6.6	391	29	7.4
12	33	3	9.1	257	5	1.9	290	8	2.8
Total	210	55	26.2	1,273	127	9.8	1,483	182	12.2

SECOND QUARTER

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	72	30	41.7	387	53	13.7	457	83	18.1
10	60	16	26.7	283	17	6.0	343	33	9.6
11	45	3	6.7	346	18	5.2	391	21	5.4
12	33	2	6.1	257	7	2.7	290	9	3.1
Total	210	51	24.3	1,273	95	7.5	1,483	146	9.8

Individual Students Not Previously Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	72	18	25.0	387	40	10.3	457	58	12.6
10	60	10	16.7	283	13	4.6	343	23	6.7
11	45	2	4.4	346	16	4.6	391	18	4.6
12	33	2	6.1	257	7	2.7	290	9	3.1
Total	210	32	15.2	1,273	76	5.9	1,483	108	7.3

THIRD QUARTER

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	72	58	80.6	387	55	14.2	457	113	24.7
10	60	9	15.0	283	13	4.6	343	22	6.4
11	45	4	8.9	346	4	1.2	391	8	2.0
12	33	0	0	257	1	.4	290	1	.3
Total	210	71	33.8	1,273	73	5.7	1,483	144	9.7

Individual Students Not Previously Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	72	27	37.5	387	32	8.3	457	59	12.9
10	60	4	6.7	283	10	3.5	343	14	4.1
11	45	1	2.2	346	2	.6	391	3	.8
12	33	0	0	257	1	.4	290	1	.3
Total	210	32	15.2	1,273	45	3.5	1,483	77	5.2

TOTALS FOR 1976-1977 SCHOOL YEAR

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	72	125	173.6	387	203	52.5	457	328	71.8
10	60	49	81.7	283	62	21.9	343	111	32.4
11	45	16	35.6	346	52	15.0	391	68	17.4
12	33	6	18.2	257	13	5.1	290	19	6.6
Total	210	196	93.3	1,273	330	25.9	1,483	526	35.5

Individual Students Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	72	71	98.6	387	146	37.7	457	217	47.5
10	60	34	56.7	283	48	16.9	343	82	23.9
11	45	9	20.0	346	41	11.8	391	50	12.8
12	33	5	15.2	257	13	5.1	290	18	6.2
Total	210	119	56.7	1,273	248	19.5	1,483	367	24.7

Table 22
Student Suspension by Ethnicity and Offense for School Year 1976-1977
Durrett High School

Offense	BLACK								WHITE								TOTAL	
	1st Qtr.		2nd Qtr.		3rd Qtr.		Total		1st Qtr.		2nd Qtr.		3rd Qtr.		Total			
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
1. Arson	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1.2	0	0	0	0	2	.6	2	.4
2. Assault on Staff	0	0	3	5.9	1	1.4	4	2.0	0	0	1	1.1	3	4.1	4	1.2	8	1.5
3. Assault on Student	2	2.7	0	0	3	4.2	5	2.5	2	1.2	2	2.2	0	0	4	1.2	9	1.7
4. Burglary/Theft	3	4.1	0	0	3	4.2	6	3.1	0	0	0	0	1	1.4	1	.3	7	1.3
5. Bus Conduct	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6. Destruction of property	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7. Disruption/Disobedience (classroom)	8	10.8	3	5.9	6	8.5	17	8.8	4	2.4	0	0	0	0	4	1.2	21	4.0
8. Disruption/Disobedience (non-classroom)	5	6.7	2	3.9	1	1.4	8	4.1	17	10.5	1	1.1	6	8.2	24	7.2	32	6.1
9. Disruption/Disobedience (ex. curr. act.)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10. Excessive cutting of class	18	24.4	26	51.0	36	50.7	80	40.9	87	53.8	54	56.7	46	63.0	187	56.5	267	50.7
11. Extortion	2	2.7	2	3.9	0	0	4	2.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	.8
12. Excessive tardiness (class)	17	22.9	7	13.7	6	8.5	30	15.3	30	18.6	11	11.5	2	2.7	43	13.0	73	13.9
13. Excessive tardiness (school)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	.6	0	0	0	0	1	.3	1	.2
14. Fighting	3	4.1	3	5.9	6	8.5	12	6.1	1	.6	2	2.2	4	5.5	7	2.1	19	3.6
15. Gambling	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
16. Indecent exposure	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
17. Loitering/Trespassing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
18. Possession of alcoholic beverages	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1.1	0	0	1	.3	1	.2
19 Possession or selling of drugs	4	5.4	0	0	1	1.4	5	2.5	8	4.9	6	6.2	3	4.1	17	5.5	22	4.2
20. Possession of explosives or fireworks	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1.4	1	.3	1	.2
21. Possession of weapons	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Profanity or vulgarity	7	9.7	2	3.9	2	2.8	11	5.6	1	.6	1	1.1	3	4.1	5	1.5	16	3.0
23. Selling goods illegally	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
24. Smoking in unassigned area	5	6.7	3	5.9	4	5.6	12	6.1	9	5.6	16	16.8	4	5.5	29	8.8	41	7.8
25. Truancy (over 16 yrs. of age)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
26. Walkout participation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
27. Violation of dress code	0	0	0	0	2	2.8	2	1.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	.4
TOTALS	74	100%	51	100%	71	100%	196	100%	162	100%	95	100%	73	100%	330	100%	526	100%

e 2

Student Suspension by Fthnicity and Grade Level for School Year 1976-1977

Eastern High School

FIRST QUARTER

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	61	43	70.5	278	19	6.8	339	62	18.2
10	62	20	32.3	289	16	5.5	351	36	10.2
11	56	14	25.0	289	7	2.4	345	21	6.1
12	31	7	22.6	243	6	2.5	274	13	4.7
Total	210	84	40.0	1,099	48	4.4	1,309	132	10.1

Individual Students Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	61	28	45.9	278	17	6.1	339	45	13.2
10	62	12	19.4	289	11	3.8	351	23	6.5
11	56	10	17.8	289	6	2.1	345	16	4.6
12	31	5	16.1	243	6	2.5	274	11	4.0
Total	210	55	26.2	1,099	40	3.6	1,309	95	7.2

SECOND QUARTER

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	61	17	27.9	278	16	5.8	339	33	9.7
10	62	10	16.1	289	25	8.7	351	35	9.9
11	56	18	32.1	289	16	5.5	345	34	9.8
12	31	11	35.5	243	4	1.6	274	15	5.5
Total	210	56	26.6	1,099	61	5.6	1,309	117	8.9

Individual Students Not Previously Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	61	4	6.6	278	15	5.4	339	19	5.6
10	62	4	6.5	289	19	6.6	351	23	6.5
11	56	8	14.3	289	11	3.8	345	19	5.5
12	31	10	32.3	243	3	1.2	274	13	4.7
Total	210	26	12.4	1,099	48	4.4	1,309	74	5.6

THIRD QUARTER

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	61	13	21.3	278	24	8.6	339	37	10.9
10	62	8	12.9	289	36	12.5	351	44	12.5
11	56	17	30.4	289	28	9.7	345	45	13.0
12	31	3	9.7	243	4	1.6	274	7	2.6
Total	210	41	19.5	1,099	92	8.4	1,309	133	10.2

Individual Students Not Previously Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	61	5	8.2	278	11	3.9	339	16	4.7
10	62	4	6.5	289	24	8.3	351	28	7.9
11	56	6	10.7	289	17	5.9	345	23	6.7
12	31	2	6.5	243	2	.8	274	4	1.5
Total	210	17	8.1	1,099	54	4.9	1,309	71	5.4

TOTALS FOR 1976-1977 SCHOOL YEAR

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	61	73	119.7	278	59	21.2	339	132	38.9
10	62	38	61.3	289	77	26.6	351	115	32.8
11	56	49	87.5	289	51	17.6	345	100	28.9
12	31	21	67.7	243	14	5.8	274	35	12.8
Total	210	181	86.2	1,099	201	18.3	1,309	382	29.2

Individual Students Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	61	37	60.7	278	43	15.5	339	80	23.6
10	62	20	32.3	289	54	18.7	351	74	21.1
11	56	24	42.9	289	34	11.8	345	58	16.8
12	31	17	54.8	243	11	4.5	274	28	10.2
Total	210	98	46.7	1,099	142	12.9	1,309	240	18.3

Table 24

Student Suspension by Ethnicity and Offense for School Year 1976-1977

Eastern High School

	BLACK								WHITE								TOTAL	
	1st Qtr.		2nd Qtr.		3rd Qtr.		Total		1st Qtr.		2nd Qtr.		3rd Qtr.		Total			
Offense	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
1. Arson	0	0	1	1.8	0	0	1	.6	0	0	1	1.6	0	0	1	.5	2	.5
2. Assault on Staff	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3. Assault on Student	1	1.2	0	0	0	0	1	.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	.3
4. Burglary/Theft	0	0	1	1.8	0	0	1	.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	.3
5. Bus Conduct	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6. Destruction of property	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7. Disruption/Disobedience (classroom)	8	9.5	6	10.7	0	0	14	7.7	2	4.2	1	1.6	2	2.2	5	2.5	19	5.0
8. Disruption/Disobedience (non-classroom)	5	5.9	1	1.8	4	9.8	10	5.5	0	0	2	3.3	0	0	2	1.0	12	3.1
9. Disruption/Disobedience (ex. curr. act.)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10. Excessive cutting of class	39	46.4	26	46.4	21	51.2	86	47.4	29	60.2	38	62.4	64	69.5	131	65.1	217	56.7
11. Extortion	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
12. Excessive tardiness (class)	12	14.3	9	16.1	6	14.6	27	14.8	7	14.6	6	9.8	11	11.9	24	11.9	51	13.3
13. Excessive tardiness (school)	0	0	0	0	2	4.9	2	1.1	0	0	1	1.6	2	2.2	3	1.5	5	1.3
14. Fighting	10	11.9	4	7.1	4	9.8	18	9.9	1	2.1	2	3.3	3	3.3	6	3.0	24	6.3
15. Gambling	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
16. Indecent exposure	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
17. Loitering/Trespassing	0	0	0	0	1	2.4	1	.6	0	0	0	0	1	1.1	1	.5	2	.5
18. Possession of alcoholic beverages	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	6.3	0	0	2	2.2	5	2.5	5	1.3
19 Possession or selling of drugs	0	0	1	1.8	0	0	1	.6	2	4.2	7	11.5	5	5.4	14	7.0	15	3.9
20. Possession of explosives or fireworks	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Possession of weapons	1	1.2	0	0	0	0	1	.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	.3
22. Profanity or vulgarity	1	1.2	2	3.6	2	4.9	5	2.8	1	2.1	0	0	0	0	1	.5	6	1.6
23. Selling goods illegally	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
24. Smoking in unassigned area	3	3.6	1	1.8	0	0	4	2.2	3	6.3	2	3.3	2	2.2	7	3.5	11	2.9
25. Truancy (over 16 yrs. of age)	4	4.8	4	7.1	0	0	8	4.4	0	0	1	1.6	0	0	1	.5	9	2.4
26. Walkout participation	0	0	0	0	1	2.4	1	.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	.3
27. Violation of dress code	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTALS	84	100%	56	100%	41	100%	181	100%	48	100%	61	100%	92	100%	201	100%	382	100%

142

143

Table 2

Student Suspension by Ethnicity and Grade Level for School Year 1976-1977

Fairdale High School

FIRST QUARTER

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	71	16	22.5	407	6	1.5	478	22	4.6
10	78	28	35.9	270	2	0.7	348	30	8.6
11	54	5	9.3	277	0	0.0	331	5	1.5
12	32	1	3.1	225	1	0.4	257	2	0.8
Total	235	50	21.2	1,179	9	0.8	1,414	59	4.2

Individual Students Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	71	14	19.7	407	6	1.5	478	20	4.2
10	78	19	24.4	270	2	0.7	348	21	6.0
11	54	5	9.3	277	0	0.0	331	5	1.5
12	32	1	3.1	225	1	0.4	275	2	0.8
Total	235	39	16.6	1,179	9	0.7	1,414	48	3.4

SECOND QUARTER

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	71	10	14.1	407	11	2.7	478	21	4.4
10	78	23	29.5	270	11	4.1	348	34	9.7
11	54	8	14.8	277	4	1.4	331	12	3.6
12	32	3	9.4	225	5	2.2	257	8	3.1
Total	235	44	18.7	1,179	31	2.6	1,414	75	5.3

Individual Students Not Previously Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	71	4	5.6	407	9	2.2	478	13	2.7
10	78	10	12.8	270	5	1.9	348	15	4.3
11	54	6	11.1	277	4	1.4	331	10	3.0
12	32	3	9.4	225	4	1.8	275	7	2.5
Total	235	23	9.8	1,179	22	1.9	1,414	45	3.2

THIRD QUARTER

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	71	8	11.3	407	8	1.9	478	16	3.3
10	78	17	21.8	270	7	2.6	348	24	6.9
11	54	5	9.3	277	4	1.4	331	9	2.7
12	32	2	6.3	225	1	.4	257	3	1.2
Total	235	32	13.6	1,179	20	1.7	1,414	52	3.7

Individual Students Not Previously Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	71	4	5.6	407	6	1.5	478	10	2.1
10	78	5	6.4	270	5	1.9	348	10	2.9
11	54	2	3.7	277	4	1.4	331	6	1.8
12	32	2	6.3	225	1	.4	257	3	1.2
Total	235	13	5.5	1,179	16	1.4	1,414	29	2.1

TOTALS FOR 1976-1977 SCHOOL YEAR

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	71	34	47.9	407	25	6.1	478	59	12.3
10	78	68	87.2	270	20	7.4	348	88	25.3
11	54	18	33.3	277	8	2.9	331	26	7.9
12	32	6	18.8	225	7	3.1	257	13	5.1
Total	235	126	53.6	1,179	60	5.1	1,414	186	13.2

Individual Students Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	71	22	30.9	407	21	5.2	478	43	8.9
10	78	34	43.6	270	12	4.4	348	46	13.2
11	54	13	24.1	277	8	2.9	331	21	6.3
12	32	6	18.8	255	6	2.4	257	12	4.7
Total	235	75	31.9	1,179	47	4.0	1,414	122	8.6

Table 26
Student Suspension by Ethnicity and Offense for School Year 1976-1977
Fairdale High School

Offense	BLACK 1st Qtr. #	%	2nd Qtr. #	%	3rd Qtr. #	%	Total #	%	WHITE 1st Qtr. #	%	2nd Qtr. #	%	3rd Qtr. #	%	Total #	%	TOTAL #	%
1. Arson	1	2.0	0	0	1	3.1	2	1.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1.1
2. Assault on Staff	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1.1
3. Assault on Student	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	11.1	0	0	0	0	1	1.7	1	.5
4. Burglary/Theft	2	4.0	0	0	2	6.3	4	3.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	2.2
5. Bus Conduct	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6. Destruction of property	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	6.5	0	0	2	3.3	2	1.1
7. Disruption/Disobedience (classroom)	6	12.0	7	15.9	5	15.6	18	14.3	0	0	1	3.2	3	15.0	4	6.7	22	11.8
8. Disruption/Disobedience (non-classroom)	8	16.0	10	22.6	5	15.6	23	18.3	0	0	3	9.7	1	5.0	4	6.7	27	14.5
9. Disruption/Disobedience (ex. curr. act.)	1	2.0	0	0	0	0	1	.8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	.5
10. Excessive cutting of class	9	18.0	14	31.8	10	31.3	33	26.1	5	55.6	8	25.8	11	55.0	24	40.0	57	30.7
11. Extortion	1	2.0	0	0	0	0	1	.8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	.5
12. Excessive tardiness (class)	3	6.0	1	2.3	4	12.5	8	6.3	0	0	0	0	3	15.0	3	5.0	11	5.9
13. Excessive tardiness (school)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
14. Fighting	4	8.0	7	15.9	0	0	11	8.7	3	33.3	8	25.8	2	10.0	13	21.6	24	12.9
15. Gambling	0	0	1	2.3	1	3.1	2	1.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1.1
16. Indecent exposure	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
17. Loitering/Trespassing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
18. Possession of alcoholic beverages	2	4.0	0	0	0	0	2	1.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1.1
19 Possession or selling of drugs	2	4.0	2	4.6	0	0	4	3.2	0	0	7	22.5	0	0	7	11.7	11	5.9
20. Possession of explosives or fireworks	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Possession of weapons	1	2.0	1	2.3	0	0	2	1.6	0	0	2	6.5	0	0	2	3.3	4	2.2
22. Profanity or vulgarity	5	10.0	1	2.3	4	12.5	10	7.9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.4
23. Selling goods illegally	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
24. Smoking in unassigned area	3	6.0	0	0	0	0	3	2.4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1.6
25. Truancy (over 16 yrs. of age)	1	2.0	0	0	0	0	1	.8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	.5
26. Walkout participation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
27. Violation of dress code	1	2.0	0	0	0	0	1	.8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	.5
TOTALS	50	100%	44	100%	32	100%	126	100%	9	100%	31	[illegible]	2[illegible]	100%	[illegible]0	[illegible]	1[illegible]	100%

le

Student Suspension by Ethnicity and Grade Level for School Year 1976-1977

Fern Creek High School

FIRST QUARTER

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	83	55	66.3	385	38	9.9	468	93	19.8
10	61	24	39.3	307	16	5.2	368	40	10.8
11	79	33	41.3	273	27	9.9	352	60	16.9
12	46	13	28.3	230	11	4.8	276	24	8.6
Total	269	125	46.5	1,195	92	7.7	1,464	217	14.7

Individual Students Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	83	31	37.3	385	30	7.8	468	61	12.9
10	61	17	27.9	307	12	3.9	368	29	7.8
11	79	16	20.3	273	22	8.1	352	38	10.7
12	46	11	23.9	230	9	3.9	276	20	7.2
Total	269	75	27.9	1,195	73	6.1	1,464	148	10.0

SECOND QUARTER

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	83	51	61.4	385	43	11.2	468	94	20.0
10	61	15	24.6	307	18	5.9	368	33	8.9
11	79	33	41.7	273	24	8.8	352	57	16.1
12	46	15	32.6	230	22	9.6	276	37	13.3
Total	269	114	42.4	1,195	107	8.9	1,464	221	15.0

Individual Students Not Previously Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	83	28	33.7	385	28	7.5	468	56	11.9
10	61	9	14.8	307	15	4.8	368	24	6.5
11	79	18	22.8	273	22	8.1	352	40	11.3
12	46	13	28.3	230	20	8.7	276	33	11.8
Total	269	68	25.3	1,195	85	7.1	1,464	153	10.4

THIRD QUARTER

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	83	51	61.4	385	67	17.4	468	118	25.2
10	61	28	45.9	307	33	10.7	368	61	16.6
11	79	41	51.9	273	38	13.9	352	79	22.4
12	46	11	23.9	230	9	3.9	276	20	7.2
Total	269	131	48.7	1,195	147	12.3	1,464	278	18.9

Individual Students Not Previously Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	83	32	38.6	385	53	13.8	468	85	18.2
10	61	19	31.1	307	31	10.1	368	50	13.6
11	79	23	40.5	273	32	11.7	352	55	15.6
12	46	7	15.2	230	9	3.9	276	16	5.8
Total	269	81	30.1	1,195	125	10.5	1,464	206	14.1

TOTALS FOR 1976-1977 SCHOOL YEAR

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	83	157	189.2	385	148	38.4	468	305	65.2
10	61	67	109.8	307	67	21.8	368	134	36.4
11	79	107	135.4	273	89	32.6	352	196	55.7
12	46	39	84.8	230	42	18.3	276	81	29.3
Total	269	370	137.5	1,195	346	28.9	1,464	716	[illegible]

Individual Students Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	83	91	109.6	385	111	[illegible]	468	202	43.2
10	61	45	73.8	307	58	18.9	368	103	27.9
11	79	57	72.2	273	76	27.8	352	133	37.8
12	46	31	67.4	230	38	16.5	276	69	25.0
Total	269	224	83.3	1,195	283	23.7	1,464	507	34.6

Table 28
Student Suspension by Ethnicity and Offense for School Year 1976-1977

Fern Creek High School

Offense	BLACK 1st Qtr. #	%	2nd Qtr. #	%	3rd Qtr. #	%	Total #	%	WHITE 1st Qtr. #	%	2nd Qtr. #	%	3rd Qtr. #	%	Total #	%	TOTAL #	%
1. Arson	0	0	1	.9	0	0	1	.3	1	1.1	0	0	0	0	1	.3	2	.3
2. Assault on Staff	0	0	1	.9	0	0	1	.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	.1
3. Assault on Student	4	3.2	2	1.8	1	.8	7	1.9	0	0	1	.9	0	0	1	.3	8	1.1
4. Burglary/Theft	0	0	4	3.2	3	2.3	7	1.9	0	0	2	1.8	1	.7	3	.9	10	1.4
5. Bus Conduct	1	.8	4	3.2	4	3.1	9	2.4	0	0	1	.9	0	0	1	.3	10	1.4
6. Destruction of property	1	.8	0	0	1	.8	2	.5	0	0	0	0	1	.7	1	.3	3	.4
7. Disruption/Disobedience (classroom)	25	20.0	28	24.6	25	19.1	78	21.1	10	10.8	9	8.5	12	8.7	31	8.7	109	15.3
8. Disruption/Disobedience (non-classroom)	15	12.0	11	10.0	14	10.4	40	10.8	1	1.1	7	6.5	14	9.5	22	6.4	62	8.6
9. Disruption/Disobedience (ex. curr. act.)	0	0	0	0	1	.8	1	.3	0	0	1	.9	0	0	1	.3	2	.3
10. Excessive cutting of class	24	19.2	30	26.4	52	39.7	106	28.6	41	44.6	32	29.9	65	44.2	138	39.9	244	34.1
11. Extortion	0	0	3	2.6	0	0	3	.8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	.4
12. Excessive tardiness (class)	26	20.8	17	15.0	19	14.5	62	16.8	14	15.2	17	15.9	19	12.7	50	14.5	112	15.7
13. Excessive tardiness (school)	3	2.4	3	2.6	0	0	6	1.6	13	14.1	22	20.7	15	10.2	50	14.5	56	7.9
14. Fighting	9	7.2	8	7.0	3	2.3	20	5.4	7	7.6	7	6.5	11	7.5	25	7.2	45	6.3
15. Gambling	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
16. Indecent exposure	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
17. Loitering/Trespassing	1	.8	0	0	2	1.5	3	.8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	.4
18. Possession of alcoholic beverages	1	.8	0	0	0	0	1	.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	.1
19 Possession or selling of drugs	5	4.0	0	0	1	.8	6	1.6	2	2.2	5	4.7	2	1.4	9	2.6	15	2.1
20. Possession of explosives or fireworks	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1.4	2	.6	2	.3
21. Possession of weapons	1	.8	0	0	0	0	1	.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	.1
22. Profanity or vulgarity	4	3.2	2	1.8	3	2.3	9	2.4	2	2.2	3	2.8	2	1.4	7	2.0	16	2.2
23. Selling goods illegally	0	0	0	0	1	.8	1	.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	.1
24. Smoking in unassigned area	3	2.4	0	0	1	.8	4	1.1	1	1.1	0	0	1	.7	2	.6	6	.8
25. Truancy (over 16 yrs. of age)	2	1.6	0	0	0	0	2	.5	0	0	0	0	2	1.4	2	.6	4	.6
26. Walkout participation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
27. Violation of dress code	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTALS	125	100%	114	100%	131	100%	370	100%	92	100%	107	100%	147	100%	346	100%	716	100%

150

151

Table 29

Student Suspension by Ethnicity and Grade Level for School Year 1976-1977

Iroquois High School

FIRST QUARTER

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	184	45	24.5	518	116	22.4	702	161	22.8
10	166	24	14.5	419	56	13.4	585	80	13.6
11	128	22	17.2	376	20	5.3	504	42	8.3
12	98	4	4.1	340	23	6.8	438	27	6.2
Total	576	95	18.2	1,653	215	13.0	2,229	310	13.8

Individual Students Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	184	40	21.8	518	110	21.2	702	150	21.3
10	166	22	13.3	419	53	12.6	585	75	12.7
11	128	19	14.8	376	19	5.1	504	38	7.5
12	98	4	4.1	340	22	6.5	438	26	5.9
Total	576	85	14.7	1,653	204	12.3	2,229	289	12.9

SECOND QUARTER

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	184	6	3.3	518	8	1.5	702	14	1.9
10	166	14	8.4	419	7	1.7	585	21	3.6
11	128	1	.8	376	4	1.1	504	5	.9
12	98	7	7.1	340	3	.9	438	10	2.3
Total	576	28	4.8	1,653	22	1.3	2,229	50	2.2

Individual Students Not Previously Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	184	4	2.2	518	4	.7	702	8	1.1
10	166	9	5.4	419	6	1.4	585	15	2.5
11	128	0	0	376	3	.8	504	3	.6
12	98	5	5.1	340	3	.9	438	8	1.8
Total	576	18	3.1	1,653	16	.9	2,229	34	1.5

THIRD QUARTER

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	184	43	23.4	518	52	10.0	702	95	13.5
10	166	18	10.8	419	20	4.8	585	38	6.5
11	128	13	10.2	376	8	2.1	504	21	4.2
12	98	6	6.1	340	4	1.2	438	10	2.3
Total	576	80	13.9	1,653	84	5.1	2,229	164	7.4

Individual Students Not Previously Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	184	24	13.0	518	29	5.6	702	53	7.5
10	166	10	6.0	419	16	3.8	585	26	4.4
11	128	9	7.0	376	5	1.3	504	14	2.8
12	98	5	5.1	340	3	.9	438	8	1.8
Total	576	48	8.3	1,653	53	3.2	2,229	101	4.5

TOTALS FOR 1976-1977 SCHOOL YEAR

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	184	94	51.1	518	176	33.9	702	270	38.5
10	166	56	33.7	419	83	19.8	585	139	23.8
11	128	36	28.1	376	32	8.5	504	68	13.5
12	98	17	17.3	340	30	8.8	438	47	10.7
Total	576	203	35.2	1,653	321	19.4	2,229	524	23.5

Individual Students Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	184	68	36.9	518	143	27.6	702	211	30.1
10	166	41	24.7	419	75	17.9	585	116	19.8
11	128	28	21.9	376	27	7.2	504	55	10.9
12	98	14	14.3	340	28	8.2	438	42	9.6
Total	576	151	26.2	1,653	273	16.5	2,229	424	19.0

Table 30
Student Suspension by Ethnicity and Offense for School Year 1976-1977
Iroquois High School

Offense	BLACK								WHITE								TOTAL	
	1st Qtr.		2nd Qtr.		3rd Qtr.		Total		1st Qtr.		2nd Qtr.		3rd Qtr.		Total			
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
1. Arson	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1.2	1	.3	1	.2
2. Assault on Staff	2	2.1	1	3.6	2	2.5	5	2.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	1.0
3. Assault on Student	2	2.1	2	7.1	2	2.5	6	2.9	2	.9	0	0	0	0	2	.6	8	1.5
4. Burglary/Theft	11	11.6	2	7.1	0	0	13	6.5	4	1.8	0	0	0	0	4	1.2	17	3.2
5. Bus Conduct	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1.2	1	.3	1	.2
6. Destruction of property	0	0	1	3.6	0	0	1	.5	5	2.3	0	0	0	0	5	1.6	6	1.1
7. Disruption/Disobedience (classroom)	13	13.7	3	10.7	9	11.2	25	12.4	6	2.8	2	9.1	6	7.1	14	4.3	39	7.4
8. Disruption/Disobedience (non-classroom)	8	8.4	6	21.4	16	20.0	30	14.8	5	2.3	4	18.3	25	29.7	34	10.7	64	12.2
9. Disruption/Disobedience (ex. curr. act.)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4.5	0	0	1	.3	1	.2
10. Excessive cutting of class	5	5.4	4	14.3	15	18.8	24	11.8	18	8.4	1	4.5	33	39.3	52	16.3	76	14.5
11. Extortion	1	1.0	1	3.6	3	3.8	5	2.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	1.0
12. Excessive tardiness (class)	5	5.4	0	0	0	0	5	2.5	4	1.8	0	0	0	0	4	1.2	9	1.7
13. Excessive tardiness (school)	1	1.0	3	10.7	10	12.5	14	6.9	1	.5	2	9.1	2	2.4	5	1.6	19	3.6
14. Fighting	18	18.9	4	14.3	13	16.2	35	17.2	7	3.3	5	22.7	5	5.9	17	5.3	52	9.9
15. Gambling	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
16. Indecent exposure	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	.5	0	0	0	0	1	.3	1	.2
17. Loitering/Trespassing	0	0	0	0	1	1.2	1	.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	.2
18. Possession of alcoholic beverages	1	1.0	0	0	1	1.2	2	.9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	.4
19 Possession or selling of drugs	2	2.1	1	3.6	3	3.8	6	2.9	2	.9	5	22.7	3	3.6	10	3.1	16	3.1
20. Possession of explosives or fireworks	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1.2	1	.3	1	.2
21. Possession of weapons	0	0	0	0	2	2.5	2	.9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	.4
22. Profanity or vulgarity	1	1.0	0	0	0	0	1	.5	1	.5	0	0	4	4.8	5	1.6	6	1.1
23. Selling goods illegally	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
24. Smoking in unassigned area	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	.5	0	0	1	1.2	2	.6	2	.4
25. Truancy (over 16 yrs. of age)	2	2.1	0	0	3	3.8	5	2.5	7	3.3	2	9.1	2	2.4	11	3.4	16	3.1
26. Walkout participation	23	24.2	0	0	0	0	23	11.3	151	70.2	0	0	0	0	151	47.0	174	33.2
27. Violation of dress code	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTALS	95	100%	28	100%	80	100%	203	100%	215	100%	22	100%	84	100%	321	100%	524	100%

Table 31
Student Suspension by Ethnicity and Grade Level for School Year 1976-1977
Jeffersontown High School

FIRST QUARTER

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	112	26	23.2	397	11	2.8	509	37	7.3
10	65	11	16.9	351	3	0.8	416	14	3.4
11	84	28	33.3	343	10	2.9	427	38	8.9
12	49	5	10.2	318	9	2.8	367	14	3.8
Total	310	70	22.5	1,409	33	2.3	1,719	103	5.9

Individual Students Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	112	21	18.8	397	9	2.3	509	30	5.9
10	65	8	12.3	351	3	0.8	416	11	2.6
11	84	12	14.3	343	6	1.7	427	18	4.2
12	49	2	3.9	318	5	1.6	367	7	1.9
Total	310	43	13.9	1,409	23	1.6	1,719	66	3.8

SECOND QUARTER

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	112	14	12.5	397	6	1.5	509	20	3.9
10	65	4	6.2	351	5	1.4	416	9	2.2
11	84	8	9.5	343	0	0	427	8	1.9
12	49	1	2.1	318	7	2.2	367	8	2.2
Total	310	27	8.7	1,409	18	1.3	1,719	45	2.6

Individual Students Not Previously Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	112	7	6.3	397	6	1.5	509	13	2.6
10	65	1	1.5	351	4	1.1	416	5	1.2
11	84	3	3.6	343	0	0	427	3	.7
12	49	0	0	318	3	.9	367	3	.8
Total	310	11	3.5	1,409	13	.9	1,719	24	1.4

THIRD QUARTER

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	112	14	12.5	397	23	5.8	509	37	7.3
10	65	15	23.1	351	16	4.6	416	31	7.5
11	84	8	9.5	343	8	2.3	427	16	3.7
12	49	1	2.0	318	0	0	367	1	.3
Total	310	38	12.3	1,409	47	3.3	1,719	85	4.9

Individual Students Not Previously Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	112	8	7.1	397	12	3.0	509	20	3.9
10	65	7	10.8	351	10	2.8	416	17	4.1
11	84	2	2.4	343	1	.3	427	3	.7
12	49	1	2.0	318	0	0	367	1	.3
Total	310	18	5.8	1,409	23	1.6	1,719	41	2.4

TOTALS FOR 1976-1977 SCHOOL YEAR

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	112	54	48.2	397	40	10.1	509	94	18.5
10	65	30	46.2	351	24	6.8	416	54	12.9
11	84	44	52.4	343	18	5.2	427	62	14.5
12	49	7	14.3	318	16	5.0	367	23	6.3
Total	310	135	43.5	1,409	98	6.9	1,719	233	13.6

Individual Students Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	112	36	32.1	397	27	6.8	509	63	12.4
10	65	16	24.6	351	17	4.8	416	33	7.9
11	84	17	20.2	343	7	2.0	427	24	5.6
12	49	3	6.1	318	8	2.5	367	11	2.9
Total	310	72	23.2	1,409	59	4.1	1,719	131	7.6

Table 32
Student Suspension by Ethnicity and Offense for School Year 1976-1977

Jeffersontown High School

	BLACK								WHITE								TOTAL	
	1st Qtr.		2nd Qtr.		3rd Qtr.		Total		1st Qtr.		2nd Qtr.		3rd Qtr.		Total			
Offense	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
1. Arson	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2. Assault on Staff	3	4.3	0	0	0	0	3	2.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1.3
3. Assault on Student	2	2.8	0	0	1	2.6	3	2.2	2	6.1	0	0	0	0	2	2.0	5	2.1
4. Burglary/Theft	1	1.4	0	0	0	0	1	.7	2	6.1	0	0	0	0	2	2.0	3	1.3
5. Bus Conduct	1	1.4	0	0	0	0	1	.7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	.4
6. Destruction of property	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7. Disruption/Disobedience (classroom)	10	14.3	9	33.4	7	18.4	26	19.4	1	3.0	2	11.1	4	8.5	7	7.2	33	14.2
8. Disruption/Disobedience (non-classroom)	7	10.0	1	3.7	1	2.6	9	6.7	3	9.1	0	0	1	2.1	4	4.1	13	5.6
9. Disruption/Disobedience (ex. curr. act.)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.0	0	0	1	2.1	2	2.0	2	.9
10. Excessive cutting of class	20	28.7	4	14.8	14	36.8	38	28.2	7	21.2	1	5.6	30	63.8	38	38.8	76	32.6
11. Extortion	1	1.4	0	0	0	0	1	.7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	.4
12. Excessive tardiness (class)	4	5.8	3	11.1	1	2.6	8	5.9	2	6.1	1	5.6	2	4.3	5	5.2	13	5.6
13. Excessive tardiness (school)	1	1.4	1	3.7	0	0	2	1.5	1	3.0	0	0	0	0	1	1.0	3	1.3
14. Fighting	10	14.3	4	14.8	9	23.9	23	17.1	7	21.2	3	16.6	6	12.8	16	16.3	39	16.7
15. Gambling	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
16. Indecent exposure	0	0	1	3.7	0	0	1	.7	0	0	0	0	2	4.3	2	2.0	3	1.3
17. Loitering/Trespassing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
18. Possession of alcoholic beverages	2	2.8	0	0	0	0	2	1.5	1	3.0	0	0	0	0	1	1.0	3	1.3
19 Possession or selling of drugs	2	2.8	2	7.4	0	0	4	2.9	2	6.1	3	16.6	1	2.1	6	6.2	10	4.3
20. Possession of explosives or fireworks	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Possession of weapons	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.6	0	0	1	1.0	1	.4
22. Profanity or vulgarity	2	2.8	0	0	4	10.5	6	4.4	1	3.0	0	0	0	0	1	1.0	7	3.0
23. Selling goods illegally	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
24. Smoking in unassigned area	4	5.8	2	7.4	1	2.6	7	5.2	3	9.1	7	38.9	0	0	10	10.2	17	7.3
25. Truancy (over 16 yrs. of age)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
26. Walkout participation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
27. Violation of dress code	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTALS	70	100%	27	100%	38	100%	135	100%	33	100%	18	100%	47	100%	98	100%	233	100%

Table 38

Student Suspension by Ethnicity and Grade Level for School Year 1976-1977
Male High School

FIRST QUARTER

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	48	11	22.9	385	75	19.5	433	86	19.8
10	27	6	22.2	287	20	6.9	314	26	8.2
11	49	6	12.2	208	15	7.2	257	21	8.1
12	40	1	2.5	148	6	4.1	189	7	3.7
Total	164	24	14.6	1,028	116	11.3	1,192	140	11.7

Individual Students Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	48	7	14.6	385	56	14.5	433	63	14.5
10	27	3	11.1	287	17	5.9	314	20	6.3
11	49	4	8.2	208	13	6.3	257	17	6.5
12	40	1	2.5	148	5	3.4	189	6	3.2
Total	165	15	9.1	1,028	91	8.8	1,192	106	8.8

SECOND QUARTER

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	48	5	10.4	385	56	14.5	433	61	14.1
10	27	2	7.4	287	20	6.9	314	22	6.9
11	49	3	6.1	208	7	3.4	257	10	3.8
12	40	2	5.0	149	1	.7	189	3	1.6
Total	164	12	7.3	1,028	84	8.2	1,192	96	8.1

Individual Students Not Previously Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	48	4	8.3	385	28	7.3	433	32	7.4
10	27	2	7.4	287	12	4.2	314	14	4.4
11	49	1	2.1	208	5	2.4	257	6	2.3
12	40	1	2.5	149	1	.7	189	2	1.1
Total	164	8	4.9	1,028	46	4.5	1,192	54	4.5

THIRD QUARTER

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	48	17	35.4	385	52	13.5	433	69	15.9
10	27	7	25.9	287	21	7.3	314	28	8.9
11	49	6	12.2	208	22	10.5	257	28	10.8
12	40	1	2.5	149	1	.7	189	2	1.1
Total	164	31	18.9	1,028	96	9.3	1,192	127	14.5

Individual Students Not Previously Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	48	10	20.8	385	37	9.6	433	47	10.9
10	27	4	14.8	287	16	5.6	314	20	6.3
11	49	6	12.2	208	20	9.6	257	26	10.1
12	40	1	2.5	149	1	.7	189	2	1.1
Total	164	21	98.1	1,028	74	7.2	1,192	95	7.9

TOTALS FOR 1976-1977 SCHOOL YEAR

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	48	33	68.8	385	183	47.5	433	216	49.9
10	27	15	55.6	287	61	21.3	314	76	24.2
11	49	15	30.6	208	44	21.2	257	59	22.9
12	40	4	10.0	149	8	5.4	189	12	6.3
Total	164	67	40.8	1,028	296	28.8	1,192	363	30.5

Individual Students Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	48	21	43.8	385	121	31.4	433	142	32.8
10	27	9	33.3	287	46	15.7	314	54	17.2
11	49	11	22.4	208	38	18.3	257	49	19.1
12	40	3	7.5	149	7	4.7	189	10	5.3
Total	164	44	26.8	1,028	211	20.5	1,192	255	21.4

Table 34
Student Suspension by Ethnicity and Offense for School Year 1976-1977

Male High School

	BLACK								WHITE								TOTAL	
	1st Qtr.		2nd Qtr.		3rd Qtr.		Total		1st Qtr.		2nd Qtr.		3rd Qtr.		Total			
Offense	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
1. Arson	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	.9	0	0	0	0	1	.3	1	.3
2. Assault on Staff	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3. Assault on Student	1	4.2	0	0	0	0	1	1.0	1	.9	1	1.2	0	0	2	.7	3	.8
4. Burglary/Theft	3	12.5	2	16.6	0	0	5	7.0	0	0	4	4.7	1	1.0	5	1.7	10	2.8
5. Bus Conduct	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1.0	1	.3	1	.3
6. Destruction of property	0	0	0	0	2	6.0	2	3.0	0	0	0	0	3	3.1	3	1.0	5	1.4
7. Disruption/Disobedience (classroom)	3	12.5	2	16.6	1	3.2	6	9.0	12	10.1	3	3.6	2	2.1	17	5.7	23	6.2
8. Disruption/Disobedience (non-classroom)	1	4.2	0	0	0	0	1	1.0	4	3.4	5	5.9	0	0	9	3.4	10	2.8
9. Disruption/Disobedience (ex. curr. act.)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10. Excessive cutting of class	5	20.8	6	50.0	18	58.1	29	43.0	56	48.3	46	54.8	47	49.1	149	50.4	178	49.0
11. Extortion	4	16.6	0	0	0	0	4	6.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	1.1
12. Excessive tardiness (class)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2.4	1	1.0	3	1.0	3	.8
13. Excessive tardiness (school)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
14. Fighting	4	16.6	0	0	1	3.2	5	7.0	10	8.6	11	13.1	5	5.2	26	8.8	31	8.5
15. Gambling	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
16. Indecent exposure	0	0	0	0	1	3.2	1	1.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	.3
17. Loitering/Trespassing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2.6	1	1.2	0	0	4	1.4	4	1.1
18. Possession of alcoholic beverages	1	4.2	0	0	1	3.2	2	3.0	1	.9	0	0	0	0	1	.3	3	.8
19 Possession or selling of drugs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	7.8	2	2.4	6	6.2	17	5.7	17	4.7
20. Possession of explosives or fireworks	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Possession of weapons	1	4.2	0	0	0	0	1	1.0	1	.9	2	2.4	0	0	3	1.0	4	1.1
22. Profanity or vulgarity	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	.9	1	1.2	2	2.1	4	1.4	4	1.1
23. Selling goods illegally	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1.2	0	0	1	.3	1	.3
24. Smoking in unassigned area	1	4.2	2	16.6	0	0	3	4.2	16	13.8	5	5.9	6	6.2	27	9.1	30	8.3
25. Truancy (over 16 yrs. of age)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	.9	0	0	0	0	1	.3	1	.3
26. Walkout participation	0	0	0	0	7	23.0	7	10.0	0	0	0	0	21	22.0	21	7.1	28	7.7
27. Violation of dress code	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1.0	1	.3	1	.3
TOTALS	24	100%	12	100%	31	100%	67	100%	116	100%	84	100%	96	100%	296	100%	363	100%

Table 25
Student Suspension by Ethnicity and Grade Level for School Year 1976-1977
Manual High School

FIRST QUARTER

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	330	155	46.9	542	62	11.4	872	217	24.9
10	176	63	35.8	414	43	10.4	490	106	17.9
11	161	37	22.9	345	30	8.7	506	67	13.2
12	118	12	10.2	264	5	1.9	382	17	4.5
Total	785	267	33.9	1,565	140	8.9	2,350	407	17.3

Individual Students Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	330	118	35.8	542	57	10.5	872	175	20.0
10	176	47	26.7	414	39	9.4	590	86	14.6
11	161	30	18.6	345	23	6.7	506	53	10.5
12	118	9	7.6	264	5	1.9	382	14	3.7
Total	785	204	25.9	1,565	124	7.9	2,350	328	13.9

SECOND QUARTER

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	330	80	24.2	542	37	6.8	872	117	13.4
10	176	38	21.6	414	23	5.5	590	61	10.3
11	161	16	9.9	345	4	1.2	506	20	3.9
12	118	17	14.4	264	8	3.1	382	25	6.5
Total	785	151	19.2	1,565	72	4.6	2,350	223	9.5

Individual Students Not Previously Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	330	65	19.7	542	36	6.6	872	101	11.6
10	176	26	14.7	414	20	4.8	590	46	7.8
11	161	14	8.7	345	4	1.2	506	18	3.6
12	118	13	11.1	264	8	3.1	382	21	5.5
Total	785	118	15.1	1,565	68	4.3	2,350	186	7.9

THIRD QUARTER

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	330	92	27.8	542	29	5.4	872	121	13.9
10	176	54	30.7	414	16	3.9	590	70	11.9
11	161	15	9.3	345	6	1.7	506	21	4.2
12	118	14	11.8	264	4	1.5	382	18	4.7
Total	785	175	22.3	1,565	55	3.5	2,350	230	9.8

Individual Students Not Previously Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	330	83	25.2	542	26	4.8	872	109	12.5
10	176	39	22.2	414	16	3.9	590	55	9.3
11	161	11	6.8	345	6	17.2	506	17	3.4
12	118	10	8.5	264	4	1.5	382	14	3.7
Total	785	143	18.2	1,565	52	3.3	2,350	195	8.3

TOTALS FOR 1976-1977 SCHOOL YEAR

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	330	327	99.1	542	128	23.6	872	455	52.2
10	176	155	88.1	414	82	19.8	590	237	40.2
11	161	68	42.2	345	40	11.6	506	108	21.3
12	118	43	36.4	264	17	6.4	382	60	15.7
Total	785	593	75.4	1,565	267	17.1	2,350	860	36.5

Individual Students Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	330	266	80.6	542	119	21.9	872	385	44.2
10	176	112	63.6	414	75	18.1	590	187	31.7
11	161	55	34.2	345	33	9.6	506	88	17.4
12	118	32	27.1	264	17	6.4	382	49	12.8
Total	785	465	59.2	1,565	244	15.6	2,350	709	30.2

Table 36
Student Suspension by Ethnicity and Offense for School Year 1976-1977
Manual High School

	BLACK								WHITE								TOTAL	
	1st Qtr.		2nd Qtr.		3rd Qtr.		Total		1st Qtr.		2nd Qtr.		3rd Qtr.		Total			
Offense	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
1. Arson	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2. Assault on Staff	5	1.9	1	.7	3	1.7	9	1.5	2	1.4	0	0	0	0	2	.7	11	1.3
3. Assault on Student	8	2.9	2	1.4	2	1.1	12	2.0	0	0	1	1.4	0	0	1	.4	13	1.5
4. Burglary/Theft	6	2.2	2	1.4	5	2.9	13	2.2	3	2.1	0	0	0	0	3	1.1	16	1.9
5. Bus Conduct	1	.4	0	0	0	0	1	.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	.1
6. Destruction of property	0	0	0	0	3	1.7	3	.5	0	0	1	1.4	0	0	1	.4	4	.5
7. Disruption/Disobedience (classroom)	50	18.8	23	15.2	24	13.7	97	16.4	12	8.6	15	20.8	14	25.7	41	15.4	138	16.0
8. Disruption/Disobedience (non-classroom)	47	17.6	32	21.2	40	22.9	119	20.0	24	17.2	14	19.4	12	21.9	50	18.7	169	19.7
9. Disruption/Disobedience (ex. curr. act.)	2	.7	0	0	1	.6	3	.5	1	.7	0	0	0	0	1	.4	4	.5
10. Excessive cutting of class	29	10.9	14	9.3	18	10.3	61	10.3	30	21.4	9	12.5	16	29.3	55	20.6	116	13.5
11. Extortion	4	1.5	0	0	1	.6	5	.8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	.6
12. Excessive tardiness (class)	3	1.1	4	2.6	2	1.1	9	1.5	2	1.4	0	0	1	1.8	3	1.1	12	1.4
13. Excessive tardiness (school)	1	.4	3	1.9	6	3.4	10	1.7	0	0	0	0	3	5.5	3	1.1	13	1.5
14. Fighting	20	7.5	29	19.2	16	9.1	65	10.9	13	9.3	9	12.5	3	5.5	25	9.4	90	10.5
15. Gambling	0	0	0	0	1	.6	1	.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	.1
16. Indecent exposure	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
17. Loitering/Trespassing	71	26.6	31	20.6	44	25.1	146	24.6	27	19.3	13	18.1	5	5.5	45	16.9	191	22.1
18. Possession of alcoholic beverages	2	.7	1	.7	1	.6	4	.7	0	0	2	2.8	0	0	2	.7	6	.7
19 Possession or selling of drugs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
20. Possession of explosives or fireworks	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1.8	1	.4	1	.1
21. Possession of weapons	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Profanity or vulgarity	12	4.5	3	1.9	5	2.9	20	3.4	2	1.4	2	2.8	0	0	4	1.5	24	2.8
23. Selling goods illegally	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
24. Smoking in unassigned area	5	1.9	6	3.9	2	1.1	13	2.2	14	10.0	5	6.9	0	0	19	7.1	32	3.7
25. Truancy (over 16 yrs. of age)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
26. Walkout participation	1	.4	0	0	0	0	1	.2	10	7.2	0	0	0	0	10	3.7	11	1.3
27. Violation of dress code	0	0	0	0	1	.6	1	.2	0	0	1	1.4	0	0	1	.4	2	.2
TOTALS	267	100%	151	100%	175	100%	593	100%	140	100%	72	100%	55	100%	267	[illegible]	8[illegible]	100

le

Student Suspension by Ethnicity and Grade Level for School Year 1976-1977

Moore High School

FIRST QUARTER

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	120	50	41.7	385	41	10.6	505	91	17.9
10	81	20	24.7	341	10	2.9	422	30	7.1
11	75	11	14.7	336	14	4.2	411	25	6.1
12	30	5	16.7	271	9	3.3	301	14	4.7
Total	306	86	28.1	1,333	74	5.5	1,639	160	9.7

Individual Students Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	120	36	30.0	385	37	9.6	505	73	14.4
10	81	15	18.5	341	9	2.6	422	24	5.7
11	75	8	10.7	336	13	3.9	411	21	5.1
12	30	4	13.3	271	8	2.9	301	12	3.9
Total	306	63	20.6	1,333	67	5.0	1,639	130	7.9

SECOND QUARTER

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	120	28	23.3	385	38	9.9	505	66	12.9
10	81	20	24.7	341	12	3.5	422	32	7.6
11	75	8	10.7	336	11	3.3	411	19	4.6
12	30	6	20.0	271	9	3.3	301	15	4.9
Total	306	62	20.3	1,333	70	5.3	1,639	132	8.1

Individual Students Not Previously Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	120	23	19.2	386	29	7.5	505	52	10.2
10	81	15	18.5	341	11	3.2	422	26	6.2
11	75	7	9.3	336	8	2.4	411	15	3.6
12	30	4	13.3	271	9	3.3	301	13	4.3
Total	306	49	16.0	1,333	57	4.3	1,639	106	6.5

THIRD QUARTER

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	120	41	34.2	385	22	5.7	505	63	12.5
10	81	11	13.4	341	12	3.5	422	23	5.5
11	75	16	21.3	336	12	3.6	411	28	6.8
12	30	1	3.3	271	10	3.7	301	11	3.7
Total	306	69	22.5	1,333	56	4.2	1,639	125	7.6

Individual Students Not Previously Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	120	28	23.3	385	12	3.1	505	40	7.9
10	81	5	6.2	341	9	2.6	422	14	3.3
11	75	11	14.7	336	12	3.[illegible]	411	23	5.6
12	30	0	0	271	7	2.6	301	7	2.3
Total	306	44	14.4	1,333	40	3.0	1,639	84	5.1

TOTALS FOR 1976-1977 SCHOOL YEAR

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	120	119	99.2	385	101	26.2	505	220	43.6
10	81	51	62.9	341	34	9.9	422	85	20.1
11	75	35	46.7	336	37	11.0	411	72	17.5
12	30	12	40.0	271	28	10.3	301	40	13.3
Total	306	217	70.9	1,333	200	15.0	1,639	417	25.4

Individual Students Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	120	87	72.5	386	78	20.3	505	165	32.7
10	81	35	43.2	341	29	8.5	422	64	15.2
11	75	26	34.7	336	33	9.8	411	59	14.4
12	30	8	26.7	271	24	8.9	301	32	10.6
Total	306	156	51.0	1,333	164	12.3	1,639	320	19.5

Table 38

Student Suspension by Ethnicity and Offense for School Year 1976-1977

Moore High School

Offense	BLACK 1st Qtr. #	BLACK 1st Qtr. %	BLACK 2nd Qtr. #	BLACK 2nd Qtr. %	BLACK 3rd Qtr. #	BLACK 3rd Qtr. %	BLACK Total #	BLACK Total %	WHITE 1st Qtr. #	WHITE 1st Qtr. %	WHITE 2nd Qtr. #	WHITE 2nd Qtr. %	WHITE 3rd Qtr. #	WHITE 3rd Qtr. %	WHITE Total #	WHITE Total %	TOTAL #	TOTAL %
1. Arson	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1.7	1	.5	1	.2
2. Assault on Staff	1	1.2	1	1.6	2	2.9	4	1.8	0	0	0	0	1	1.7	1	.5	5	1.2
3. Assault on Student	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2.9	0	0	2	1.0	2	.5
4. Burglary/Theft	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1.7	1	.5	1	.2
5. Bus Conduct	3	3.5	12	19.4	0	0	15	6.9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	3.6
6. Destruction of property	1	1.2	0	0	0	0	1	.5	1	1.4	0	0	0	0	1	.5	2	.5
7. Disruption/Disobedience (classroom)	16	18.5	12	19.4	5	7.2	33	15.2	3	4.1	3	4.3	4	7.1	10	5.0	43	10.3
8. Disruption/Disobedience (non-classroom)	1	1.2	1	1.6	3	4.3	5	2.3	0	0	2	2.9	3	5.4	5	2.5	10	2.4
9. Disruption/Disobedience (ex. curr. act.)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4.3	1	1.7	4	2.0	4	1.0
10. Excessive cutting of class	32	37.2	16	25.8	30	43.6	78	35.9	42	56.6	24	34.2	24	42.9	90	45.0	168	40.3
11. Extortion	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
12. Excessive tardiness (class)	9	10.5	2	3.2	8	11.6	19	8.8	6	8.1	6	8.6	2	3.6	14	7.0	33	8.0
13. Excessive tardiness (school)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1.4	1	1.7	4	2.0	4	1.0
14. Fighting	14	16.1	7	11.3	8	11.6	29	13.4	16	21.5	9	12.9	8	14.5	33	16.5	62	14.8
15. Gambling	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
16. Indecent exposure	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
17. Loitering/Trespassing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
18. Possession of alcoholic beverages	0	0	0	0	1	1.4	1	.5	1	1.4	0	0	0	0	1	.5	2	.5
19 Possession or selling of drugs	1	1.2	1	1.6	3	4.3	5	2.3	0	0	5	7.1	2	3.6	7	3.5	12	2.9
20. Possession of explosives or fireworks	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Possession of weapons	0	0	1	1.6	0	0	1	.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	.2
22. Profanity or vulgarity	7	8.1	2	3.2	4	5.9	13	5.9	2	2.7	0	0	1	1.7	3	1.5	16	3.8
23. Selling goods illegally	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
24. Smoking in unassigned area	1	1.2	6	9.7	5	7.2	12	5.5	1	1.4	15	21.4	7	12.7	23	11.5	35	8.4
25. Truancy (over 16 yrs. of age)	0	0	1	1.6	0	0	1	.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	.2
26. Walkout participation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
27. Violation of dress code	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTALS	86	100%	62	100%	69	100%	217	100%	74	100%	70	100%	56	100%	200	100%	417	100%

Table

Student Suspension by Ethnicity and Grade Level for School Year 1976-1977

Pleasure Ridge High School

FIRST QUARTER

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	100	37	37.0	385	20	10.8	485	57	11.6
10	100	30	30.0	350	17	11.3	450	47	10.4
11	79	18	22.8	323	7	4.5	402	25	6.2
12	52	5	9.6	304	6	3.8	356	11	3.1
Total	331	90	27.2	1,362	50	3.7	1,693	140	8.2

Individual Students Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	100	23	23.0	185	17	9.2	485	40	8.2
10	100	23	23.0	150	11	7.3	450	34	7.5
11	79	15	18.9	155	7	4.5	402	22	5.4
12	52	4	7.7	160	6	3.8	356	10	2.8
Total	331	65	19.6	1,362	41	3.0	1,693	106	6.2

SECOND QUARTER

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	100	54	54.0	385	51	13.2	485	105	21.4
10	100	34	34.0	350	30	8.6	450	64	14.2
11	79	24	30.4	323	27	8.4	402	51	12.6
12	52	11	21.2	304	10	3.3	356	21	5.9
Total	331	123	37.2	1,362	118	8.7	1,693	241	14.2

Individual Students Not Previously Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	100	21	21.0	385	34	8.8	485	55	11.2
10	100	20	20.0	350	17	4.9	450	37	8.2
11	79	15	18.9	323	23	7.1	402	38	9.4
12	52	4	7.7	304	7	2.3	356	11	3.1
Total	331	60	18.1	1,362	81	5.9	1,693	141	8.3

THIRD QUARTER

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	100	51	51.0	385	90	23.4	485	141	29.1
10	100	44	44.0	350	32	9.1	450	76	16.9
11	79	8	10.1	323	25	7.7	402	33	8.2
12	52	7	13.5	304	11	3.6	356	18	5.1
Total	331	110	33.2	1,362	158	11.6	1,693	268	15.8

Individual Students Not Previously Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	100	16	16.0	385	27	7.0	485	43	8.9
10	100	17	17.0	350	17	4.9	450	34	7.6
11	79	5	6.3	323	14	4.3	402	19	4.7
12	52	5	9.6	304	9	2.9	356	14	3.9
Total	331	43	12.9	1,362	67	4.9	1,693	110	6.5

TOTALS FOR 1976-1977 SCHOOL YEAR

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	100	142	142.0	385	161	41.8	485	303	62.5
10	100	108	108.0	350	79	22.6	450	187	41.6
11	79	50	63.3	323	59	18.3	402	109	27.1
12	52	23	44.2	304	27	8.9	356	50	14.0
Total	331	323	97.6	1,362	326	23.9	1,693	649	38.3

Individual Students Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	100	60	60.0	385	78	20.3	485	138	28.5
10	100	60	60.0	350	45	12.9	450	105	23.3
11	79	35	44.3	323	44	13.6	402	79	19.7
[illegible]	52	13	25.0	304	22	7.2	356	35	9.8
Total	331	168	50.8	1,362	189	13.9	1,693	357	21.1

Table 40

Student Suspension by Ethnicity and Offense for School Year 1976-1977

Pleasure Ridge High School

Offense	BLACK								WHITE								TOTAL	
	1st Qtr.		2nd Qtr.		3rd Qtr.		Total		1st Qtr.		2nd Qtr.		3rd Qtr.		Total			
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
1. Arson	0	0	1	.8	0	0	1	.3	0	0	1	.8	0	0	1	.3	2	.3
2. Assault on Staff	0	0	2	1.6	0	0	2	.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	.3
3. Assault on Student	4	4.4	0	0	0	0	4	1.2	1	2.0	1	.8	0	0	2	.6	6	.9
4. Burglary/Theft	3	3.3	1	.8	0	0	4	1.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	.6
5. Bus Conduct	2	2.2	1	.8	0	0	3	.9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	.4
6. Destruction of property	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7. Disruption/Disobedience (classroom)	14	15.7	8	6.5	4	3.6	26	8.1	1	2.0	1	.8	3	1.9	5	1.5	31	4.7
8. Disruption/Disobedience (non-classroom)	5	5.6	10	8.1	10	9.0	25	7.8	2	4.0	16	13.5	5	3.8	24	7.5	49	7.6
9. Disruption/Disobedience (ex. curr. act.)	0	0	0	0	1	.9	1	.3	0	0	0	0	3	1.9	3	.9	4	.6
10. Excessive cutting of class	27	30.0	61	49.7	63	57.4	151	46.8	16	32.0	52	44.2	93	58.9	161	49.5	312	48.0
11. Extortion	1	1.1	0	0	0	0	1	.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	.2
12. Excessive tardiness (class)	10	11.1	8	6.5	12	10.9	30	9.3	2	4.0	10	8.6	10	6.3	22	6.7	52	8.0
13. Excessive tardiness (school)	1	1.1	4	3.3	5	4.5	10	3.1	4	8.0	6	5.1	10	6.3	20	6.1	30	4.5
14. Fighting	9	10.0	11	8.9	7	6.4	27	8.4	6	12.0	8	6.8	7	4.4	21	6.4	48	7.4
15. Gambling	0	0	1	.8	0	0	1	.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	.2
16. Indecent exposure	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
17. Loitering/Trespassing	0	0	2	1.6	0	0	2	.6	3	6.0	11	9.4	0	0	14	4.3	16	2.5
18. Possession of alcoholic beverages	0	0	1	.8	0	0	1	.3	0	0	0	0	1	.6	1	.3	2	.3
19 Possession or selling of drugs	1	1.1	0	0	0	0	1	.3	3	6.0	0	0	1	.6	4	1.2	5	.8
20. Possession of explosives or fireworks	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Possession of weapons	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2.0	0	0	0	0	1	.3	1	.2
22. Profanity or vulgarity	4	4.4	5	4.1	0	0	9	2.8	3	6.0	2	1.6	1	.6	6	1.8	15	2.3
23. Selling goods illegally	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
24. Smoking in unassigned area	6	6.7	5	4.1	8	7.3	19	5.9	8	16.0	9	7.6	23	14.7	40	12.3	59	9.1
25. Truancy (over 16 yrs. of age)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	.8	0	0	1	.3	1	.2
26. Walkout participation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
27. Violation of dress code	3	3.3	2	1.6	0	0	5	1.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	.8
TOTALS	90	100%	123	100%	110	100%	323	100%	50	100%	118	100%	158	100%	326	100%	649	100%

Tab[redacted]1

Student Suspension by Ethnicity and Grade Level for School Year 1976-1977

Seneca High School

FIRST QUARTER

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	111	23	20.7	326	13	3.9	437	36	8.2
10	71	9	12.7	305	10	3.3	376	19	4.9
11	78	5	6.4	284	3	1.1	362	5	2.2
12	45	3	6.7	276	0	0.0	321	3	0.9
Total	305	40	13.1	1,191	26	2.2	1,496	66	4.4

Individual Students Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	111	18	16.2	326	11	3.4	437	29	6.6
10	71	8	11.3	305	8	2.6	376	16	4.2
11	78	5	6.4	284	3	1.1	362	8	2.2
12	45	2	4.4	276	0	0.0	321	2	0.6
Total	305	33	10.8	1,191	22	1.8	1,496	55	3.6

SECOND QUARTER

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	111	13	11.7	326	17	5.2	437	30	6.8
10	71	10	14.1	305	7	2.3	376	17	4.5
11	78	3	3.8	284	5	1.8	362	8	2.2
12	45	1	2.2	276	4	1.5	321	5	1.6
Total	305	27	8.9	1,191	33	2.8	1,496	60	3.9

Individual Students Not Previously Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	111	11	9.9	326	10	3.1	437	21	4.8
10	71	9	12.7	305	7	2.3	376	16	4.2
11	78	2	2.6	284	5	1.8	362	7	1.9
12	45	1	2.2	276	4	1.5	321	5	1.6
Total	305	23	7.5	1,191	26	2.2	1,496	49	3.2

THIRD QUARTER

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	111	19	17.1	326	11	3.4	437	30	6.9
10	71	6	8.5	305	19	6.2	376	25	6.6
11	78	3	3.8	284	8	2.8	362	11	3.0
12	45	1	2.2	276	5	1.8	321	6	1.9
Total	305	29	9.5	1,191	43	3.6	1,496	72	4.8

Individual Students Not Previously Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	111	18	16.2	326	10	3.1	437	28	6.4
10	71	5	7.0	305	18	5.9	376	23	6.1
11	78	3	3.8	284	7	2.5	362	10	2.8
12	45	1	2.2	276	5	1.8	321	6	1.9
Total	305	27	8.9	1,191	40	3.4	1,496	67	4.5

TOTALS FOR 1976-1977 SCHOOL YEAR

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	111	55	49.5	326	41	12.6	437	96	21.9
10	71	25	35.2	305	36	11.8	376	61	16.2
11	78	11	14.1	284	16	5.6	362	27	7.5
12	45	5	11.1	276	9	3.3	321	14	4.4
Total	305	96	31.5	1,191	102	8.6	1,496	198	13.2

Individual Students Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	111	47	42.3	326	31	9.5	437	78	17.8
10	71	22	30.9	305	33	10.8	376	55	14.6
11	78	10	12.8	284	15	5.3	362	25	6.9
12	45	4	8.9	276	9	3.3	321	13	4.0
Total	305	83	27.2	1,191	88	7.4	1,496	171	11.4

Table 42
Student Suspension by Ethnicity and Offense for School Year 1976-1977
Seneca High School

Offense	BLACK								WHITE								TOTAL	
	1st Qtr.		2nd Qtr.		3rd Qtr.		Total		1st Qtr.		2nd Qtr.		3rd Qtr.		Total			
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
1. Arson	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2. Assault on Staff	2	5.0	4	14.9	2	6.9	8	8.3	2	7.7	1	3.0	2	4.7	5	4.9	13	6.6
3. Assault on Student	0	0	1	3.7	1	3.4	2	2.1	1	3.3	0	0	1	2.4	2	1.9	4	2.0
4. Burglary/Theft	1	2.5	1	3.7	1	3.4	3	3.1	0	0	1	3.0	0	0	1	.9	4	2.0
5. Bus Conduct	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6. Destruction of property	1	2.5	0	0	1	3.4	2	2.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1.0
7. Disruption/Disobedience (classroom)	9	22.5	3	11.1	2	6.9	14	14.6	3	11.6	0	0	1	2.4	4	3.9	18	9.1
8. Disruption/Disobedience (non-classroom)	15	37.5	7	25.9	11	40.9	33	34.3	7	26.9	12	36.4	6	13.9	25	24.5	58	29.3
9. Disruption/Disobedience (ex. curr. act.)	1	2.5	1	3.7	0	0	2	2.1	0	0	1	3.0	0	0	1	.9	3	1.5
10. Excessive cutting of class	1	2.5	1	3.7	2	6.9	4	4.7	0	0	7	21.2	12	29.9	19	18.6	23	11.6
11. Extortion	1	2.5	2	7.4	0	0	3	3.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1.5
12. Excessive tardiness (class)	0	0	0	0	1	3.4	1	1.0	0	0	0	0	3	3.9	3	2.9	4	2.0
13. Excessive tardiness (school)	0	0	0	0	2	6.9	2	2.1	0	0	1	3.0	6	13.9	7	7.9	9	4.5
14. Fighting	3	7.5	0	0	2	6.9	5	5.2	5	19.2	1	3.0	1	2.4	7	7.9	12	6.1
15. Gambling	2	5.0	0	0	0	0	2	2.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1.0
16. Indecent exposure	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
17. Loitering/Trespassing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
18. Possession of alcoholic beverages	0	0	1	3.7	0	0	1	1.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	.5
19 Possession or selling of drugs	0	0	3	11.1	1	3.4	4	4.7	4	20.4	5	15.2	0	0	9	8.8	13	6.6
20. Possession of explosives or fireworks	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Possession of weapons	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Profanity or vulgarity	1	2.5	1	3.7	0	0	2	2.1	0	0	0	0	1	2.4	1	.9	3	1.5
23. Selling goods illegally	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
24. Smoking in unassigned area	0	0	2	7.4	1	3.4	3	3.1	1	3.8	2	6.1	4	9.3	7	7.9	10	5.1
25. Truancy (over 16 yrs. of age)	3	7.5	0	0	2	6.9	5	5.2	3	11.6	2	6.1	6	13.9	11	10.8	16	8.1
26. Walkout participation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
27. Violation of dress code	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTALS	40	100%	27	100%	29	100%	96	100%	26	100%	33	100%	43	100%	102	100%	198	100%

[illegible]ble [illegible]

Student Suspension by Ethnicity and Grade Level for School Year 1976-77

Shawnee High School

FIRST QUARTER

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	84	22	26.2	278	20	7.2	362	42	11.6
10	66	9	13.6	272	12	4.4	338	21	6.2
11	95	24	25.3	194	8	4.1	289	32	11.1
12	72	9	12.5	109	0	0.0	181	9	4.9
Total	317	64	20.2	853	40	4.7	1,170	104	8.9

Individual Students Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	84	16	19.0	278	14	5.0	362	30	8.3
10	66	6	9.1	272	12	4.4	338	18	5.3
11	95	20	21.1	194	7	3.6	289	27	9.3
12	72	7	9.7	109	0	0.0	181	7	3.9
Total	313	49	15.4	853	33	3.8	1,170	82	7.0

SECOND QUARTER

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	84	27	32.1	278	26	9.4	362	53	14.6
10	66	9	13.6	272	12	4.4	338	21	6.2
11	95	10	10.5	194	4	2.1	289	14	4.8
12	72	4	5.6	109	1	.9	181	5	2.8
Total	317	50	15.8	853	43	5.1	1,170	93	7.9

Individual Students Not Previously Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	84	20	23.8	278	24	8.6	362	44	12.1
10	66	9	13.6	272	10	3.7	338	19	5.6
11	95	8	8.4	194	3	1.5	289	11	3.8
12	72	2	2.8	109	1	.9	181	3	1.7
Total	317	39	12.3	853	38	4.4	1,170	77	6.6

THIRD QUARTER

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	84	26	30.9	278	35	1.3	362	61	16.9
10	66	18	27.3	272	12	4.4	338	30	8.9
11	95	8	8.4	194	5	2.6	289	13	4.9
12	72	1	1.4	109	2	1.8	181	3	1.7
Total	317	53	16.7	853	54	6.3	1,170	107	9.1

Individual Students Not Previously Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	84	14	16.7	278	30	10.8	362	44	12.2
10	66	13	19.7	272	12	4.4	338	25	7.4
11	95	6	6.3	194	5	2.6	289	11	3.8
12	72	1	1.4	109	2	1.8	181	3	1.7
Total	317	34	10.7	853	49	5.7	1,170	83	7.1

TOTALS FOR 1976-1977 SCHOOL YEAR

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	84	75	89.3	278	81	29.1	362	156	43.1
10	66	36	54.5	272	36	13.2	338	72	21.3
11	95	42	44.2	194	17	8.8	289	59	20.4
12	72	14	19.4	109	3	2.8	181	17	9.4
Total	317	167	52.7	853	137	16.1	1,170	304	25.9

Individual Students Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	84	50	59.5	278	68	26.5	362	118	32.6
10	66	28	42.4	272	34	12.5	338	62	18.3
11	95	34	35.8	194	15	7.7	289	49	16.9
12	72	10	13.9	109	3	2.8	181	13	7.2
Total	317	122	38.5	853	120	14.1	1,170	242	20.7

Table 44
Student Suspension by Ethnicity and Offense for School Year 1976-1977
Shawnee High School

Offense	BLACK 1st Qtr. #	%	2nd Qtr. #	%	3rd Qtr. #	%	Total #	%	WHITE 1st Qtr. #	%	2nd Qtr. #	%	3rd Qtr. #	%	Total #	%	TOTAL #	%
1. Arson	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2. Assault on Staff	1	1.6	1	2.0	2	3.8	4	2.4	0	0	0	0	1	1.9	1	.7	5	1.7
3. Assault on Student	1	1.6	2	4.0	2	3.8	5	2.9	0	0	2	4.7	0	0	2	1.5	7	2.3
4. Burglary/Theft	3	4.7	0	0	0	0	3	1.8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1.0
5. Bus Conduct	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	10.0	4	9.3	0	0	8	5.8	8	2.6
6. Destruction of property	4	6.3	0	0	0	0	4	2.4	0	0	1	2.3	0	0	1	.7	5	1.7
7. Disruption/Disobedience (classroom)	7	10.9	11	22.0	13	24.5	31	18.6	3	7.5	0	0	1	1.9	4	2.9	35	11.5
8. Disruption/Disobedience (non-classroom)	10	15.5	15	30.0	19	35.8	44	26.3	10	25.0	4	9.3	20	37.0	34	24.8	78	25.7
9. Disruption/Disobedience (ex. curr. act.)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10. Excessive cutting of class	21	32.7	15	30.0	15	28.3	51	30.5	16	40.0	27	62.9	29	53.7	72	52.6	123	40.5
11. Extortion	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2.5	0	0	0	0	1	.7	1	.3
12. Excessive tardiness (class)	1	1.6	1	2.0	0	0	2	1.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	.6
13. Excessive tardiness (school)	0	0	1	2.0	0	0	1	.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	.3
14. Fighting	5	7.8	2	4.0	1	1.9	8	4.0	2	5.0	1	2.3	0	0	3	2.2	11	3.6
15. Gambling	1	1.6	0	0	0	0	1	.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	.3
16. Indecent exposure	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
17. Loitering/Trespassing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.5	3	2.2	3	1.0
18. Possession of alcoholic beverages	3	4.7	0	0	1	1.9	4	2.4	2	5.0	0	0	0	0	2	1.5	6	2.0
19 Possession or selling of drugs	0	0	1	2.0	0	0	1	.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	.3
20. Possession of explosives or fireworks	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Possession of weapons	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Profanity or vulgarity	3	4.7	1	2.0	0	0	4	2.4	2	5.0	1	2.3	0	0	3	2.2	7	2.3
23. Selling goods illegally	1	1.6	0	0	0	0	1	.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	.3
24. Smoking in unassigned area	3	4.7	0	0	0	0	3	1.8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1.0
25. Truancy (over 16 yrs. of age)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	6.9	0	0	3	2.2	3	1.0
26. Walkout participation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
27. Violation of dress code	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTALS	64	100%	50	100%	53	100%	167	100%	40	100%	43	100%	54	100%	137	100%	304	100%

[redacted]ble [redacted]
Student Suspension by Ethnicity and Grade Level for School Year 1976-1977
Southern High School

FIRST QUARTER

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	117	70	59.8	502	47	9.4	619	117	18.9
10	66	25	37.9	378	34	8.9	444	59	13.3
11	67	17	25.4	378	34	8.9	445	51	11.4
12	58	20	34.5	385	18	6.3	343	38	11.1
Total	308	132	42.8	1,543	133	8.6	1,851	265	14.3

Individual Students Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	117	42	35.9	502	40	7.9	619	82	13.2
10	66	20	30.3	378	26	6.9	444	46	10.4
11	67	15	22.4	378	32	8.5	445	47	10.5
12	58	14	24.1	285	18	6.3	343	32	9.3
Total	308	91	29.5	1,543	116	7.5	1,851	207	11.1

SECOND QUARTER

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	117	51	43.6	502	67	13.3	619	118	19.1
10	66	24	36.4	378	23	6.1	444	47	10.6
11	67	19	28.4	378	32	8.5	445	51	11.4
12	58	14	24.1	286	24	8.4	343	38	11.1
Total	308	108	35.1	1,543	146	9.5	1,851	254	13.7

Individual Students Not Previously Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	117	31	26.5	502	53	10.6	619	84	13.6
10	66	13	19.7	378	17	4.5	444	30	6.8
11	67	10	14.9	378	28	7.4	445	38	8.5
12	58	7	12.1	285	19	6.7	343	26	7.6
Total	308	61	19.8	1,543	117	7.6	1,851	178	9.6

THIRD QUARTER

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	117	46	39.3	502	106	21.1	619	152	24.6
10	66	22	33.3	378	49	12.9	444	71	[illegible]
11	67	21	31.3	378	62	16.4	445	83	18.7
12	58	6	10.3	286	22	7.7	343	28	8.2
Total	308	95	30.8	1,543	239	15.5	1,851	334	18.0

Individual Students Not Previously Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	117	34	29.1	502	81	16.1	619	115	18.6
10	66	11	16.7	378	37	9.8	444	48	10.8
11	67	10	14.9	378	44	11.6	445	54	12.1
12	58	4	6.9	286	16	5.6	343	20	5.8
Total	308	59	19.2	1,543	178	11.5	1,851	237	12.8

TOTALS FOR 1976-1977 SCHOOL YEAR

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	117	167	142.7	502	220	43.8	619	387	62.5
10	66	71	107.6	378	106	28.0	444	177	39.9
11	67	57	85.1	378	128	33.9	445	185	41.6
12	58	40	68.9	285	64	22.5	343	104	30.3
Total	308	335	108.8	1,543	518	33.6	1,851	853	46.1

Individual Students Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	117	107	91.5	502	174	34.7	619	281	45.4
10	66	44	66.7	378	80	21.2	444	124	27.9
11	67	35	52.2	378	104	27.5	445	139	31.2
12	58	25	43.1	286	53	18.6	343	78	22.7
Total	308	211	68.5	1,543	411	26.6	1,851	622	33.6

Table 46
Student Suspension by Ethnicity and Offense for School Year 1976-1977
Southern High School

Offense	BLACK								WHITE								TOTAL	
	1st Qtr.		2nd Qtr.		3rd Qtr.		Total		1st Qtr.		2nd Qtr.		3rd Qtr.		Total			
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
1. Arson	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2. Assault on Staff	2	1.5	3	2.7	0	0	5	1.5	0	0	1	.7	0	0	1	.2	6	.7
3. Assault on Student	3	2.3	3	2.7	0	0	6	1.8	1	.7	0	0	0	0	1	.2	7	.8
4. Burglary/Theft	0	0	3	2.7	0	0	3	.9	0	0	1	.7	1	.4	2	.4	5	.6
5. Bus Conduct	0	0	1	.9	0	0	1	.3	0	0	1	.7	0	0	1	.2	2	.2
6. Destruction of property	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	.4	1	.2	1	.1
7. Disruption/Disobedience (classroom)	46	34.8	36	33.2	20	21.0	102	30.4	30	22.6	38	26.0	42	17.6	110	21.2	212	24.9
8. Disruption/Disobedience (non-classroom)	20	15.2	16	14.7	15	15.9	51	15.2	25	18.8	16	10.9	17	7.1	58	11.2	109	12.8
9. Disruption/Disobedience (ex. curr. act.)	0	0	1	.9	1	1.0	2	.6	0	0	0	0	1	.4	1	.2	3	.4
10. Excessive cutting of class	2	1.5	10	9.3	10	10.5	22	6.6	8	6.1	8	5.5	29	12.1	45	8.7	67	7.9
11. Extortion	1	.7	0	0	0	0	1	.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	.1
12. Excessive tardiness (class)	28	21.3	15	13.8	7	7.4	50	15.0	48	36.1	17	11.6	30	12.5	95	18.4	145	16.9
13. Excessive tardiness (school)	1	.7	6	5.5	15	15.8	22	6.6	0	0	27	18.5	72	30.2	99	19.1	121	14.2
14. Fighting	14	10.6	6	5.5	7	7.4	27	8.0	6	4.5	7	4.8	10	4.2	23	4.4	50	5.9
15. Gambling	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
16. Indecent exposure	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
17. Loitering/Trespassing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	.4	1	.2	1	.1
18. Possession of alcoholic beverages	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	.7	0	0	5	2.1	6	1.1	6	.7
19 Possession or selling of drugs	0	0	0	0	2	2.1	2	.6	1	.7	0	0	7	3.0	8	1.5	10	1.2
20. Possession of explosives or fireworks	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1.4	1	.4	3	.6	3	.4
21. Possession of weapons	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Profanity or vulgarity	8	6.1	1	.9	9	9.5	18	5.4	4	3.0	7	4.8	5	2.1	16	3.1	34	3.9
23. Selling goods illegally	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
24. Smoking in unassigned area	5	3.8	5	5.5	6	6.3	16	4.7	9	6.8	21	14.4	17	7.1	47	9.1	63	7.4
25. Truancy (over 16 yrs. of age)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
26. Walkout participation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
27. Violation of dress code	2	1.5	2	1.7	3	3.1	7	2.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	.8
TOTALS	132	100%	108	100%	95	100%	335	100%	133	100%	146	100%	239	100%	518	100%	853	100%

[redacted]ble [redacted]
Student Suspension by Ethnicity and Grade Level for School Year 1976-1977
Stuart High School

FIRST QUARTER

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	98	77	78.6	356	56	15.7	454	133	29.2
10	80	50	62.5	290	23	7.9	370	73	19.7
11	81	49	60.5	269	28	10.4	350	77	22.0
12	38	12	31.6	247	17	6.8	285	29	10.1
Total	297	188	63.3	1,162	124	10.7	1,459	312	21.3

Individual Students Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	98	44	44.9	356	37	10.4	454	81	17.8
10	80	34	42.5	290	19	6.6	370	53	14.3
11	81	34	41.9	269	28	10.4	350	62	17.7
12	38	9	23.7	247	16	6.5	285	25	8.7
Total	297	121	40.7	1,162	100	8.6	1,459	221	15.1

SECOND QUARTER

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	98	46	46.9	356	36	10.1	454	82	18.1
10	80	27	33.8	290	11	3.8	370	83	22.4
11	81	8	9.9	269	8	2.9	350	16	4.6
12	38	6	15.8	247	9	3.6	285	15	5.2
Total	297	87	29.3	1,162	64	5.5	1,459	151	10.3

Individual Students Not Previously Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	98	37	37.8	356	28	7.9	454	65	14.3
10	80	15	18.8	290	10	3.5	370	25	6.8
11	81	4	4.9	269	7	2.6	350	11	3.1
12	38	3	7.9	247	4	1.6	285	7	2.4
Total	297	59	19.9	1,162	49	4.2	1,459	108	7.4

THIRD QUARTER

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	98	73	74.5	356	50	14.0	454	123	27.1
10	80	53	66.3	290	17	5.9	370	70	18.9
11	81	22	27.2	269	31	11.5	350	53	15.1
12	38	5	13.2	247	5	2.0	285	10	3.5
Total	297	153	15.5	1,162	103	8.9	1,459	256	17.5

Individual Students Not Previously Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	98	17	17.3	356	27	7.6	454	44	9.7
10	80	15	18.8	290	11	3.8	370	26	7.0
11	81	11	13.6	269	22	8.2	350	33	9.4
12	38	5	13.2	247	5	2.0	285	10	3.5
Total	297	48	16.2	1,162	65	5.6	1,459	113	7.7

TOTALS FOR 1976-1977 SCHOOL YEAR

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	98	196	200.0	356	142	39.9	454	338	74.4
10	80	130	123.1	290	51	17.6	370	181	48.9
11	81	79	98.1	269	67	24.9	350	146	41.7
12	38	23	60.5	247	31	12.6	285	54	18.9
Total	297	428	144.1	1,162	291	25.1	1,459	719	49.3

Individual Students Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	98	98	100.0	356	92	25.8	454	190	41.9
10	80	64	80.0	290	40	13.8	370	104	28.1
11	81	49	60.5	269	57	21.2	350	106	30.3
12	38	17	44.7	247	25	10.1	285	42	14.7
Total	297	228	76.8	1,162	214	18.4	1,459	442	30.3

Table 48
Student Suspension by Ethnicity and Offense for School Year 1976-1977
Stuart High School

Offense	BLACK 1st Qtr. #	BLACK 1st Qtr. %	BLACK 2nd Qtr. #	BLACK 2nd Qtr. %	BLACK 3rd Qtr. #	BLACK 3rd Qtr. %	BLACK Total #	BLACK Total %	WHITE 1st Qtr. #	WHITE 1st Qtr. %	WHITE 2nd Qtr. #	WHITE 2nd Qtr. %	WHITE 3rd Qtr. #	WHITE 3rd Qtr. %	WHITE Total #	WHITE Total %	TOTAL #	TOTAL %
1. Arson	0	0	3	3.4	0	0	3	.7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	.4
2. Assault on Staff	1	.5	1	1.1	0	0	2	.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	.3
3. Assault on Student	1	.5	1	1.1	0	0	2	.5	1	.8	1	1.6	1	.9	3	1.0	5	.7
4. Burglary/Theft	8	4.3	0	0	6	3.6	14	3.3	0	0	2	3.1	0	0	2	.7	16	2.2
5. Bus Conduct	4	2.1	0	0	0	0	4	1.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	.6
6. Destruction of property	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	.9	1	.3	1	.1
7. Disruption/Disobedience (classroom)	34	18.2	11	12.7	25	16.3	70	16.3	15	12.1	7	10.9	10	9.8	32	11.0	102	14.2
8. Disruption/Disobedience (non-classroom)	19	10.1	9	10.4	12	7.8	40	9.3	7	5.6	6	9.4	3	3.0	16	5.5	56	7.8
9. Disruption/Disobedience (ex. curr. act.)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	.8	0	0	0	0	1	.3	1	.1
10. Excessive cutting of class	56	29.8	17	19.6	67	43.8	140	32.7	65	52.5	21	32.8	59	57.3	145	50.0	285	39.6
11. Extortion	6	3.2	0	0	0	0	6	1.4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	.8
12. Excessive tardiness (class)	29	15.4	37	42.5	13	8.5	79	18.4	17	13.8	9	14.0	11	10.8	37	12.7	116	16.1
13. Excessive tardiness (school)	4	2.1	0	0	0	0	4	1.0	3	2.4	0	0	0	0	3	1.0	7	1.0
14. Fighting	8	4.3	6	7.0	20	13.1	34	8.0	5	4.0	7	10.9	14	13.7	26	9.0	60	8.4
15. Gambling	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1.6	0	0	1	.3	1	.1
16. Indecent exposure	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
17. Loitering/Trespassing	1	.5	0	0	2	1.3	3	.7	0	0	0	0	1	.9	1	.3	4	.6
18. Possession of alcoholic beverages	0	0	1	1.1	0	0	1	.2	1	.8	1	1.6	0	0	2	.7	3	.4
19 Possession or selling of drugs	3	1.6	1	1.1	3	2.0	7	1.6	4	3.2	2	3.1	0	0	6	2.1	13	1.8
20. Possession of explosives or fireworks	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	.9	1	.3	1	.1
21. Possession of weapons	1	.5	0	0	0	0	1	.2	1	.8	4	6.3	1	.9	6	2.1	7	1.0
22. Profanity or vulgarity	7	3.7	0	0	5	3.3	12	2.8	3	2.4	1	1.6	1	.9	5	1.7	17	2.4
23. Selling goods illegally	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
24. Smoking in unassigned area	6	3.2	0	0	0	0	6	1.4	1	.8	2	3.1	0	0	3	1.0	9	1.3
25. Truancy (over 16 yrs. of age)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
26. Walkout participation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
27. Violation of dress code	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
190 TOTALS	188	100%	87	100%	153	100%	428	100%	124	100%	64	100%	10[illegible]	100%	291	100%	71[illegible]	100%

191

Table 40
Student Suspensions by Ethnicity and Grade Level for School 1976-1977
Thomas Jefferson High School

FIRST QUARTER

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	169	29	17.2	315	18	5.7	484	47	9.7
10	118	18	15.3	242	16	6.6	360	34	9.4
11	117	17	14.5	265	14	5.3	382	31	8.1
12	81	6	7.4	175	11	6.3	256	17	6.6
Total	485	70	14.4	997	59	5.9	1,482	129	8.7

Individual Students Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	169	16	9.5	315	13	4.1	484	29	5.9
10	118	17	14.4	242	14	5.8	360	31	8.5
11	117	13	11.1	265	13	4.9	382	26	6.8
12	81	3	3.7	175	11	6.3	256	14	5.4
Total	485	49	10.1	997	51	5.1	1,482	100	6.7

SECOND QUARTER

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	169	31	18.3	315	16	5.1	484	47	9.7
10	118	11	9.3	242	4	1.6	360	15	4.1
11	117	5	4.3	265	8	3.0	382	13	3.4
12	81	3	3.7	175	4	2.3	256	7	2.7
Total	485	50	10.3	997	32	3.2	1,482	82	5.5

Individual Students Not Previously Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	169	21	12.4	315	9	2.9	484	30	6.2
10	118	7	5.9	242	3	1.2	360	10	2.7
11	117	3	2.6	265	8	3.0	382	11	2.9
12	81	0	0	175	4	2.3	2[illegible]6	4	1.6
Total	485	31	6.4	997	24	2.4	1,482	55	3.7

THIRD QUARTER

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	169	42	24.9	315	36	11.4	484	78	16.1
10	118	21	17.8	242	16	6.6	360	37	10.3
11	117	13	11.1	265	9	3.4	382	22	5.8
12	81	1	1.2	175	1	.6	256	2	.8
Total	485	77	15.9	997	62	6.2	1,482	139	9.4

Individual Students Not Previously Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	169	32	18.9	315	27	8.6	484	59	12.2
10	118	16	13.6	242	12	4.9	360	28	7.8
11	117	11	9.4	265	8	3.0	382	19	4.9
12	81	1	1.2	175	1	.6	256	2	.8
Total	485	60	12.4	997	48	4.8	1,482	108	7.3

TOTALS FOR 1976-1977 SCHOOL YEAR

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	169	102	60.4	315	70	22.2	484	172	35.5
10	118	50	42.4	242	36	14.9	360	86	23.9
11	117	35	29.9	265	31	11.7	382	66	17.3
12	81	10	12.3	175	16	9.1	256	26	10.2
Total	485	197	40.6	997	153	15.3	1,482	350	23.6

Individual Students Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	169	69	40.8	315	49	15.6	484	118	24.4
10	118	40	33.9	242	29	11.9	360	69	19.2
11	117	27	23.1	265	29	10.9	382	56	14.7
12	81	4	4.9	175	16	9.1	256	20	7.8
Total	485	140	28.9	997	123	12.3	1,482	263	17.7

Table 50

Student Suspension by Ethnicity and Offense for School Year 1976-1977

Thomas Jefferson High School

Offense	BLACK								WHITE								TOTAL	
	1st Qtr.		2nd Qtr.		3rd Qtr.		Total		1st Qtr.		2nd Qtr.		3rd Qtr.		Total			
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
1. Arson	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2. Assault on Staff	0	0	1	2.0	0	0	1	.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	.3
3. Assault on Student	0	0	0	0	1	1.3	1	.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	.3
4. Burglary/Theft	1	1.4	0	0	0	0	1	.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	.3
5. Bus Conduct	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6. Destruction of property	0	0	2	4.0	1	1.3	3	1.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	.9
7. Disruption/Disobedience (classroom)	13	18.6	10	20.0	13	16.8	36	18.3	2	3.5	0	0	9	14.5	11	7.2	47	13.4
8. Disruption/Disobedience (non-classroom)	4	5.7	6	12.0	14	18.2	24	12.2	8	13.5	4	12.5	6	9.7	18	11.8	42	12.0
9. Disruption/Disobedience (ex. curr. act.)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10. Excessive cutting of class	16	22.8	4	8.0	27	35.1	47	23.9	23	38.9	11	34.4	27	43.7	61	39.9	108	30.9
11. Extortion	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
12. Excessive tardiness (class)	6	8.6	9	18.0	7	9.1	22	11.2	4	6.7	2	6.3	2	3.2	8	5.2	30	8.6
13. Excessive tardiness (school)	17	24.4	7	14.0	8	10.4	32	16.2	5	8.5	0	0	2	3.2	7	4.6	39	11.0
14. Fighting	7	10.0	5	10.0	2	2.6	14	7.2	7	11.9	1	3.1	3	4.8	11	7.2	25	7.1
15. Gambling	0	0	0	0	2	2.6	2	1.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	.6
16. Indecent exposure	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
17. Loitering/Trespassing	1	1.4	3	6.0	2	2.6	6	3.0	2	3.5	2	6.3	0	0	4	2.6	10	2.9
18. Possession of alcoholic beverages	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	6.7	2	6.3	0	0	6	3.9	6	1.7
19 Possession or selling of drugs	0	0	1	2.0	0	0	1	.5	0	0	4	12.4	1	1.6	5	3.3	6	1.7
20. Possession of explosives or fireworks	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Possession of weapons	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Profanity or vulgarity	3	4.3	0	0	0	0	3	1.5	3	5.1	1	3.1	2	3.2	6	3.9	9	2.6
23. Selling goods illegally	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
24. Smoking in unassigned area	2	2.8	2	4.0	0	0	4	2.0	1	1.7	5	15.6	3	4.8	9	5.8	13	3.7
25. Truancy (over 16 yrs. of age)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3.2	2	1.3	2	.6
26. Walkout participation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	8.1	5	3.3	5	1.4
27. Violation of dress code	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTALS	70	100%	50	100%	77	100%	197	100%	39	100%	32	100%	62	100%	153	100%	350	100%

Table 51
Student Suspension by Ethnicity and Grade Level for School Year 1976-1977
Valley High School

FIRST QUARTER

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	90	34	37.8	374	20	5.3	464	54	11.6
10	72	10	13.9	266	8	3.0	348	18	5.2
11	77	11	14.3	243	1	0.4	320	12	3.7
12	48	3	6.3	240	3	1.3	286	6	2.1
Total	287	58	20.2	1,123	32	2.8	1,410	90	6.3

Individual Students Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	90	23	25.6	374	13	3.5	464	36	7.7
10	72	9	12.5	266	7	2.6	348	16	4.7
11	77	10	12.9	243	1	0.4	320	11	3.4
12	48	3	6.3	240	3	1.3	288	6	2.1
Total	287	45	15.7	1,123	24	2.1	1,410	69	4.8

SECOND QUARTER

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	90	12	13.3	374	13	3.5	464	25	5.4
10	72	13	18.1	266	11	4.1	348	24	6.9
11	77	14	18.2	243	4	1.6	320	18	5.6
12	48	3	6.3	240	18	7.5	286	21	7.3
Total	287	42	14.6	1,123	46	4.1	1,410	88	6.2

Individual Students Not Previously Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	90	7	7.8	374	10	2.7	464	17	3.6
10	72	9	12.5	266	9	3.4	348	18	5.2
11	77	9	11.7	243	4	1.6	320	13	4.1
12	48	3	6.3	240	17	7.1	288	20	6.9
Total	287	28	9.8	1,123	40	3.6	1,410	68	4.8

THIRD QUARTER

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	90	17	18.9	374	22	5.9	464	39	8.4
10	72	18	25.0	266	28	10.5	348	46	13.2
11	77	9	11.7	243	9	3.7	320	18	5.6
12	48	0	0	240	0	0	0	0	0
Total	287	44	15.3	1,123	59	5.3	1,410	133	7.3

Individual Students Not Previously Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	90	10	11.1	374	13	3.5	464	23	4.9
10	72	12	16.7	266	21	7.9	348	33	9.5
11	77	8	10.4	243	6	2.5	320	14	4.4
12	48	0	0	240	0	0	288	0	0
Total	287	30	10.5	1,123	40	3.6	1,410	70	4.9

TOTALS FOR 1976-1977 SCHOOL YEAR

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	90	63	70.0	374	55	14.7	464	118	25.4
10	72	41	56.9	266	47	17.7	348	88	25.3
11	77	34	44.2	243	14	5.8	320	48	8.6
12	48	6	12.5	240	21	8.6	288	27	9.4
Total	287	144	50.2	1,123	137	12.2	1,410	281	19.9

Individual Students Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	90	40	70.0	374	36	9.5	464	76	16.4
10	72	30	41.7	266	37	13.9	348	67	19.3
11	77	27	35.1	243	11	4.5	320	38	11.9
12	48	6	12.5	240	20	8.3	288	26	9.0
Total	287	103	36.2	1,123	104	9.2	1,410	207	14.7

Table 52
Student Suspension by Ethnicity and Offense for School Year 1976-1977
Valley High School

Offense	BLACK 1st Qtr. #	1st Qtr. %	2nd Qtr. #	2nd Qtr. %	3rd Qtr. #	3rd Qtr. %	Total #	Total %	WHITE 1st Qtr. #	1st Qtr. %	2nd Qtr. #	2nd Qtr. %	3rd Qtr. #	3rd Qtr. %	Total #	Total %	TOTAL #	TOTAL %
1. Arson	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2. Assault on Staff	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3. Assault on Student	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4. Burglary/Theft	1	1.7	0	0	0	0	1	.7	0	0	0	0	1	1.7	1	.7	2	.7
5. Bus Conduct	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2.2	0	0	1	.7	1	.4
6. Destruction of property	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1.7	1	.7	1	.4
7. Disruption/Disobedience (classroom)	17	29.3	3	7.1	5	11.4	25	17.4	5	15.6	2	4.4	4	6.7	11	8.0	36	12.8
8. Disruption/Disobedience (non-classroom)	3	5.2	9	21.4	4	9.1	16	11.1	1	3.1	3	6.5	2	3.4	6	4.4	22	7.8
9. Disruption/Disobedience (ex. curr. act.)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10. Excessive cutting of class	14	24.2	10	23.8	20	45.5	44	30.5	10	31.2	12	26.0	38	64.4	60	43.8	104	36.9
11. Extortion	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
12. Excessive tardiness (class)	12	20.7	6	14.3	8	18.2	26	18.1	9	28.2	0	0	3	5.1	12	8.8	38	13.5
13. Excessive tardiness (school)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.1	0	0	0	0	1	.7	1	.4
14. Fighting	4	6.9	13	30.9	5	11.4	22	15.2	4	12.5	5	10.9	5	8.5	14	10.2	36	12.8
15. Gambling	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
16. Indecent exposure	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
17. Loitering/Trespassing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
18. Possession of alcoholic beverages	2	3.4	0	0	0	0	2	1.4	0	0	2	4.4	0	0	2	1.5	4	1.4
19 Possession or selling of drugs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2.2	3	5.1	4	3.0	4	1.4
20. Possession of explosives or fireworks	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Possession of weapons	0	0	0	0	1	2.2	1	.7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	.4
22. Profanity or vulgarity	3	5.2	0	0	1	2.2	4	2.8	2	6.3	0	0	1	1.7	3	2.2	7	2.5
23. Selling goods illegally	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
24. Smoking in unassigned area	2	3.4	1	2.5	0	0	3	2.1	0	0	1	2.2	1	1.7	2	1.5	5	1.8
25. Truancy (over 16 yrs. of age)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2.2	0	0	1	.7	1	.4
26. Walkout participation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	39.0	0	0	18	13.1	18	6.4
27. Violation of dress code	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTALS	58	100%	42	100%	44	100%	144	100%	32	100%	46	100%	59	100%	137	100%	281	100%

Table 53

Student Suspension by Ethnicity and Grade Level for School Year 1976-1977

Waggener High School

FIRST QUARTER

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	88	15	17.0	293	10	3.4	381	25	6.5
10	67	9	13.4	298	4	1.3	365	13	3.5
11	56	8	14.3	286	8	2.8	342	16	4.6
12	42	2	4.8	267	1	0.4	309	3	0.9
Total	253	34	13.4	1,144	23	2.0	1,397	57	4.0

Individual Students Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	88	13	14.8	293	10	3.4	381	23	5.9
10	67	7	10.4	298	4	1.3	365	11	2.9
11	56	4	7.1	286	7	2.4	342	11	3.2
12	42	2	4.8	267	1	0.4	309	3	0.9
Total	253	26	10.3	1,144	22	1.9	1,397	48	3.4

SECOND QUARTER

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	88	13	14.8	293	9	3.1	381	21	5.5
10	67	7	10.4	298	4	1.3	364	11	2.9
11	56	4	7.1	286	2	.7	342	6	1.7
12	42	2	4.8	267	[illegible]	.7	309	4	1.3
Total	253	26	10.3	1,144	17	1.5	1,397	43	3.1

Individual Students Not Previously Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	88	12	13.6	293	7	2.4	381	19	4.9
10	67	4	5.9	298	4	1.3	365	8	2.2
11	56	4	7.1	286	2	.7	342	6	1.7
12	42	2	4.8	267	2	.7	309	4	1.3
Total	253	22	8.7	1,144	15	1.3	1,397	37	2.6

THIRD QUARTER

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	88	15	17.0	293	9	3.1	381	24	6.3
10	67	12	17.9	298	6	2.0	365	18	4.9
11	56	1	1.8	286	4	1.4	342	5	1.5
12	42	0	0	267	5	1.9	309	5	1.6
Total									

Individual Students Not Previously Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	88	8	9.1	293	9	3.1	381	17	4.5
10	67	5	7.5	298	6	2.0	365	11	3.0
11	56	0	0	286	4	1.4	342	4	1.2
12	42	0	0	267	5	1.9	309	5	1.6
Total	253	13	5.1	1,144	24	2.1	1,397	37	2.6

TOTALS FOR 1976-1977 SCHOOL YEAR

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	88	43	48.9	293	28	9.5	381	71	18.6
10	67	28	41.8	298	14	4.7	365	42	11.5
11	56	13	23.2	286	14	4.9	342	27	7.9
12	42	4	9.5	267	8	2.9	309	12	3.9
Total	253	88	34.7	1,144	64	5.6	1,397	152	10.9

Individual Students Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	88	33	37.5	293	26	8.9	381	59	15.5
10	67	16	23.9	298	14	4.7	365	30	83.3
11	56	8	14.3	286	13	4.5	342	21	6.1
12	42	4	9.5	267	8	2.9	309	12	3.9
Total	253	61	24.1	1,144	61	5.3	1,397	122	8.7

Table 54
Student Suspension by Ethnicity and Offense for School Year 1976-1977
Waggener High School

	BLACK								WHITE								TOTAL	
	1st Qtr.		2nd Qtr.		3rd Qtr.		Total		1st Qtr.		2nd Qtr.		3rd Qtr.		Total			
Offense	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
1. Arson	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2. Assault on Staff	0	0	0	0	1	3.6	1	1.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	.7
3. Assault on Student	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4. Burglary/Theft	1	2.9	0	0	1	3.6	2	2.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1.3
5. Bus Conduct	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6. Destruction of property	0	0	0	0	1	3.6	1	1.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	.7
7. Disruption/Disobedience (classroom)	6	17.7	5	19.3	11	39.3	22	25.0	1	4.3	0	0	5	20.7	6	9.4	28	18.4
8. Disruption/Disobedience (non-classroom)	8	23.5	12	46.3	3	10.7	23	26.3	7	30.5	7	41.2	6	25.0	20	31.3	43	28.3
9. Disruption/Disobedience (ex. curr. act.)	0	0	2	7.7	0	0	2	2.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1.3
10. Excessive cutting of class	3	8.8	1	3.8	2	7.1	6	6.8	4	17.5	2	11.8	1	4.2	7	10.9	13	8.5
11. Extortion	0	0	0	0	1	3.6	1	1.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	.7
12. Excessive tardiness (class)	2	5.9	1	3.8	1	3.6	4	4.5	1	4.3	0	0	1	4.2	2	3.1	6	3.9
13. Excessive tardiness (school)	0	0	1	3.8	0	0	1	1.1	0	0	0	0	1	4.2	1	1.6	2	1.3
14. Fighting	4	11.8	0	0	2	7.1	6	6.8	2	8.7	0	0	0	0	2	3.1	8	5.3
15. Gambling	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
16. Indecent exposure	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
17. Loitering/Trespassing	1	2.9	0	0	0	0	1	1.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	.7
18. Possession of alcoholic beverages	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4.3	0	0	0	0	1	1.6	1	.7
19 Possession or selling of drugs	0	0	0	0	2	7.1	2	2.3	0	0	0	0	1	4.2	1	1.6	3	1.9
20. Possession of explosives or fireworks	1	2.9	0	0	0	0	1	1.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	.7
21. Possession of weapons	0	0	1	3.8	0	0	1	1.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	.7
22. Profanity or vulgarity	1	2.9	1	3.8	0	0	2	2.3	1	4.3	0	0	0	0	1	1.6	3	1.9
23. Selling goods illegally	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
24. Smoking in unassigned area	5	14.8	2	7.7	1	3.6	8	9.2	5	21.8	8	47.0	8	33.3	21	32.7	29	19.1
25. Truancy (over 16 yrs. of age)	2	5.9	0	0	2	7.1	4	4.5	1	4.3	0	0	1	4.2	2	3.1	6	3.9
26. Walkout participation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
27. Violation of dress code	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
202 TOTALS	34	100%	26	100%	28	100%	88	100%	23	100%	17	100%	24	100%	64	100%	152	100% 203
[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]

[redacted]ble[redacted]

Student Suspension by Etnicity and Grade Level for School Year 1976-1977
Western High School

FIRST QUARTER

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	149	45	30.2	439	32	7.3	588	77	13.1
10	79	7	8.9	348	7	2.0	427	14	3.3
11	101	21	20.8	364	8	2.2	465	29	6.2
12	81	5	6.2	296	1	0.3	377	6	1.6
Total	410	78	19.1	1,447	48	3.3	1,857	126	6.8

Individual Students Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	149	36	24.2	439	30	6.8	588	66	11.2
10	79	7	8.9	348	7	2.0	427	14	3.3
11	101	20	19.8	364	8	2.2	465	28	6.0
12	81	3	3.7	296	1	0.3	377	4	1.1
Total	410	66	16.1	1,447	46	3.2	1,857	122	6.0

SECOND QUARTER

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	149	33	22.1	439	20	4.6	588	53	8.9
10	79	12	15.2	348	6	1.7	427	18	4.2
11	101	15	14.8	364	1	.3	465	16	3.4
12	81	4	4.9	296	0	0	377	4	1.1
Total	410	64	15.6	1,447	27	1.9	1,857	91	4.9

Individual Students Not Previously Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	149	24	16.1	439	18	4.1	588	42	7.1
10	79	9	11.4	348	5	1.4	427	14	3.3
11	101	11	10.9	364	1	.3	465	12	2.6
12	81	4	4.9	296	0	0	377	4	1.1
Total	410	48	11.7	1,447	24	1.6	1,857	72	3.9

THIRD QUARTER

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	
9	149	12	8.1	439	10	2.3	588	22	3.7
10	79	9	11.4	348	4	1.1	427	13	3.0
11	101	2	1.9	364	3	.8	465	5	1.1
12	81	0	0	296	0	0	377	0	0
Total	410	23	5.6	1,447	17	1.2	1,857	40	2.2

Individual Students Not Previously Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	149	4	2.7	439	6	1.4	588	10	1.7
10	79	2	2.5	348	3	.9	427	5	1.2
11	101	0	0	364	3	.8	465	3	.6
12	81	0	0	296	0	0	377	0	0
Total	410	6	1.5	1,447	12	.8	1,857	18	.9

TOTALS FOR 1976-1977 SCHOOL YEAR

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	149	90	60.4	439	62	14.1	588	152	25.8
10	79	28	35.4	348	17	4.9	427	45	10.5
11	101	38	37.6	364	12	3.3	465	50	10.8
12	81	9	11.1	296	1	0	377	10	2.7
Total	410	165	40.2	1,447	92	6.4	1,857	257	13.8

Individual Students Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	149	64	42.9	439	54	12.3	588	118	20.0
10	79	18	22.8	348	15	4.3	427	33	7.7
11	101	31	30.7	364	12	3.2	465	43	9.2
12	81	7	8.6	296	1	3.3	377	8	2.1
Total	410	120	29.3	1,447	82	5.7	1,857	202	10.9

Table 56
Student Suspension by Ethnicity and Offense for School Year 1976-1977
Western High School

Offense	BLACK 1st Qtr. #	%	2nd Qtr. #	%	3rd Qtr. #	%	Total #	%	WHITE 1st Qtr. #	%	2nd Qtr. #	%	3rd Qtr. #	%	Total #	%	TOTAL #	%
1. Arson	0	0	1	1.6	0	0	1	.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	.4
2. Assault on Staff	1	1.3	0	0	0	0	1	.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	.4
3. Assault on Student	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4. Burglary/Theft	1	1.3	4	6.2	1	4.3	6	3.6	0	0	0	0	2	11.8	2	2.2	8	3.1
5. Bus Conduct	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6. Destruction of property	2	2.6	0	0	0	0	2	1.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	.8
7. Disruption/Disobedience (classroom)	2	2.6	4	6.2	1	4.3	7	4.2	0	0	1	3.7	1	5.9	2	2.2	9	3.5
8. Disruption/Disobedience (non-classroom)	0	0	0	0	1	4.3	1	.6	1	2.1	0	0	0	0	1	1.1	2	.8
9. Disruption/Disobedience (ex. curr. act.)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10. Excessive cutting of class	11	14.1	33	51.6	11	47.8	55	33.3	6	12.6	12	44.4	9	52.9	27	29.3	82	31.8
11. Extortion	0	0	1	1.6	0	0	1	.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
12. Excessive tardiness (class)	44	56.4	3	4.7	1	4.3	48	29.0	20	41.6	0	0	1	5.9	21	22.8	69	26.8
13. Excessive tardiness (school)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
14. Fighting	1	1.3	6	9.3	3	13.2	10	6.0	0	0	1	3.7	0	0	1	1.1	11	4.3
15. Gambling	1	1.3	0	0	0	0	1	.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	.4
16. Indecent exposure	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
17. Loitering/Trespassing	0	0	1	1.6	0	0	1	.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	.4
18. Possession of alcoholic beverages	1	1.3	1	1.6	0	0	2	1.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	.8
19 Possession or selling of drugs	0	0	0	0	1	4.3	1	.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	.4
20. Possession of explosives or fireworks	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Possession of weapons	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.9	1	1.1	1	.4
22. Profanity or vulgarity	0	0	3	4.7	2	8.9	5	3.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	1.9
23. Selling goods illegally	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
24. Smoking in unassigned area	14	17.8	7	10.9	1	4.3	22	13.3	20	41.6	13	48.2	3	17.6	36	39.1	58	22.6
25. Truancy (over 16 yrs. of age)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
26. Walkout participation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2.1	0	0	0	0	1	1.1	1	.4
27. Violation of dress code	0	0	0	0	1	4.3	1	.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	.4
TOTALS	78	100%	64	100%	23	100%	165	100%	48	100%	27	100%	17	100%	92	100%	257	100%

[redacted]ble[redacted]

Student Suspension by Ethnicity and Grade Level for School Year 1976-1977
Westport High School

FIRST QUARTER

Incidances of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	106	47	44.3	307	17	5.5	413	64	15.3
10	64	24	37.5	230	17	7.4	294	41	13.6
11	70	27	38.6	289	12	4.2	359	39	10.8
12	43	16	37.2	214	6	2.8	257	22	8.4
Total	283	114	40.3	1,040	52	5.0	1,323	166	12.4

Individual Students Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	106	32	30.2	307	12	3.9	413	44	10.5
10	64	13	20.3	230	16	6.9	294	29	9.6
11	70	18	25.7	289	11	3.8	359	29	8.0
12	43	11	25.6	214	6	2.8	257	17	6.5
Total	283	74	26.1	1,040	45	4.3	1,323	119	8.8

SECOND QUARTER

Incidantes of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	106	15	14.2	307	16	5.2	413	31	7.4
10	64	5	7.8	230	8	3.5	294	13	4.3
11	70	8	11.4	289	9	3.1	359	17	4.7
12	43	3	6.9	214	3	1.4	257	6	2.3
Total	283	31	10.9	1,040	36	3.5	1,323	67	4.9

Individual Students Not Previously Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	106	12	11.3	307	13	4.2	413	25	5.9
10	64	5	7.8	230	8	3.5	294	13	4.3
11	70	7	10.0	289	9	3.1	359	16	4.4
12	43	2	4.7	214	3	1.4	257	5	1.9
Total	283	26	9.2	1,040	33	3.2	1,323	59	4.4

THIRD QUARTER

Incidences of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suscansion	%
9	106	36	33.9	307	20	6.5	413	56	13.6
10	64	17	26.6	230	11	4.8	294	28	9.5
11	70	12	17.1	289	1	.3	359	13	3.6
12	43	2	4.7	214	4	1.9	257	6	2.3
Total	283	67	23.7	1,040	36	3.5	1,323	103	7.9

Individual Students Not Previously Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	106	23	21.7	307	17	5.5	413	40	9.7
10	64	11	17.2	230	9	3.9	294	20	6.8
11	70	6	8.6	289	1	.3	359	7	1.9
12	43	2	4.7	214	3	1.4	257	5	1.9
Total	283	42	14.8	1,040	30	2.9	1,323	72	5.4

TOTALS FOR 1976-1977 SCHOOL YEAR

Incidances of Suspensions

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	106	98	92.4	307	53	17.3	413	151	36.6
10	64	46	71.9	230	36	15.7	294	82	27.9
11	70	47	67.1	289	22	7.6	359	69	19.2
12	43	21	48.8	214	13	6.1	257	34	13.2
Total	283	212	74.9	1,040	124	11.9	1,323	336	25.4

Individual Students Suspended

GRADE	Black			White			Total		
	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%	Population	Suspension	%
9	106	67	63.2	307	42	13.7	413	109	26.4
10	64	29	45.3	230	33	14.3	294	62	21.1
11	70	31	44.2	289	21	[illegible]	359	52	14.5
12	43	15	34.8	214	12	5.6	257	27	10.5
Total	283	142	50.2	1,040	108	10.4	1,323	250	18.9

Table 58

Student Suspension by Ethnicity and Offense for School Year 1976-1977

Westport High School

Offense	BLACK								WHITE								TOTAL	
	1st Qtr.		2nd Qtr.		3rd Qtr.		Total		1st Qtr.		2nd Qtr.		3rd Qtr.		Total			
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
1. Arson	0	0	0	0	3	4.5	3	1.4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	.9
2. Assault on Staff	3	2.6	1	3.2	2	3.0	6	2.8	1	1.9	0	0	0	0	1	.8	7	2.1
3. Assault on Student	8	7.0	1	3.2	3	4.5	12	5.7	1	1.9	0	0	0	0	1	.8	13	3.9
4. Burglary/Theft	1	.9	1	3.2	7	10.4	9	4.2	0	0	0	0	1	2.8	1	.8	10	3.0
5. Bus Conduct	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6. Destruction of property	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1.9	1	2.8	1	2.8	3	2.4	3	.9
7. Disruption/Disobedience (classroom)	9	7.9	2	6.5	12	17.9	23	10.8	3	5.8	1	2.8	0	0	4	3.2	27	8.1
8. Disruption/Disobedience (non-classroom)	24	21.1	13	41.9	14	20.9	51	24.1	4	7.7	5	13.9	8	22.2	17	13.8	68	20.2
9. Disruption/Disobedience (ex. curr. act.)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2.8	0	0	1	.8	1	.3
10. Excessive cutting of class	31	27.2	5	16.2	12	17.9	48	22.7	19	36.5	16	44.4	15	41.6	50	40.3	98	29.1
11. Extortion	2	1.7	1	3.2	0	0	3	1.4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	.9
12. Excessive tardiness (class)	0	0	0	0	1	1.5	1	.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	.3
13. Excessive tardiness (school)	0	0	0	0	1	1.5	1	.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	.3
14. Fighting	19	16.7	2	6.5	6	8.9	27	12.8	11	21.2	1	2.8	2	5.6	14	11.3	41	12.2
15. Gambling	2	1.7	0	0	0	0	2	.9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	.6
16. Indecent exposure	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
17. Loitering/Trespassing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2.8	0	0	1	.8	1	.3
18. Possession of alcoholic beverages	1	.9	1	3.2	1	1.5	3	1.4	3	5.8	1	2.8	2	5.6	6	4.8	9	2.7
19 Possession or selling of drugs	5	4.4	2	6.5	2	3.0	9	4.2	3	5.8	2	5.5	0	0	5	4.0	14	4.1
20. Possession of explosives or fireworks	0	0	0	0	2	3.0	2	.9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	.6
21. Possession of weapons	1	.9	0	0	0	0	1	.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	.3
22. Profanity or vulgarity	5	4.4	1	3.2	1	1.5	7	3.3	2	3.8	0	0	0	0	2	1.6	9	2.7
23. Selling goods illegally	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
24. Smoking in unassigned area	2	1.7	1	3.2	0	0	3	1.4	4	7.7	6	16.6	7	19.4	17	13.8	20	5.9
25. Truancy (over 16 yrs. of age)	1	.9	0	0	0	0	1	.5	0	0	1	2.8	0	0	1	.8	2	.6
26. Walkout participation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
27. Violation of dress code	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTALS	114	100%	31	100%	67	100%	212	100%	52	100%	36	100%	36	100%	124	100%	336	100%

210

210

SECTION VIII

Bibliography

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ackerly, R.L. The Reasonable Exercise of Authority. National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1970, 33 pages.

Adams, J. Fairdalis. 'Siberia' is Red, Portable Classroom. The Courier-Journal, Louisville, Kentucky, April 14, 1977.

Alschuler, A. and Shea, J.W. The Discipline Game: Playing Without Losers. Learning, 1974, 3(1), 80-86.

Alternatives to Suspension. The Practitioner, National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1977, 3, 12 pages.

American Friends Service Committee. A report on short-term, out-of school disciplinary suspensions in the junior high/middle and high schools of Richland County School District, No. 1, 1975-1976 and 1974-1975. Columbia, S.C.: Author, 1976. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 127663)

Ayres, G.E. Teacher Attitudes and Black Children. Kappa Delta Pi Record, 1970, 1(1), 22-24.

Becker, H.S. Social-Class Variations in the Teacher-Pupil Relationship. Journal of Educational Sociology, 1952, 25, 451-464.

Bettker, D.F. Suspensions: Get Rid Of 'Em'!! Thrust for Educational Leadership, 1976, 5(1), 26-27.

Bonacich, E. and Goodman, R. Deadlock in School Desegregation: A Case Study of Inglewood, California. New York, Praeger, 1972.

Braxton, M.V., and Bullock, C.S., Jr. Teacher Partiality in Desegregation. Integrated Education, 1972, 10(4), pp. 42-46.

Brophy, J.E. and Good, T.L. Teacher-Student Relationships: Causes and Consequences. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc. 1974.

Burrell, L. Black and White Students Attitudes Toward White Counselors. Journal of Negro Education, 1971, 40(1), pp. 48-52.

Buxton, T.H., Prichard, K.W., Bingham, C.M., Jackson, C.E., and Talps, L. Black and White Teachers and Desegregation. Integrated Education, 1974, 12(1-2), pp. 19-22.

Carr v. *Dignien.* 229 Mass. 304, 118 N.E. 675 (1918).

Children's Defense Fund of the Washington Research Project. *Children Out of School in America*. Author, 1974.

Children's Defense Fund of the Washington Research Project. *School Suspensions: Are They Helping Children? A Report*. Cambridge, Mass: Author, 1975. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 113797)

Clark, K.B. *Dark Ghetto: Dilemmas of Social Power*. New York: Harper & Row, 1965.

Clarke, L.W. Race and Suspension in New Orleans. *Integrated Education*, 1973, II(3), 30-33.

Demarest, S.M. & Jordan, J.F. Hawkins v. Coleman: Discriminatory Suspensions and the Effect of Institutional Racism on School Discipline. *Inequality in Education*, 1975, 20, 25-41.

Draba, R.E. Short Suspensions: The Goss Decision Establishes a Student's Due Process Rights. *Administrators Notebook*, 1975, 23(4), 1-4.

Faulk, H.R. Desegregation in McKeesport. *Integrated Education*, 1972, 10, 35-38.

Feshbach, Norma D. "Student Teacher Preferences for Elementary School Pupils Varying in Personality Characteristics." *Journal of Educational Psychology*; 60, p. 126-132, 1969.

Flygore, T.J. Two Suspension Cases the Supreme Court Must Decide. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 1974, 56, 257-258.

Fuchs, E. *Teachers Talk: Views from Inside City Schools*. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1969.

Giles, H.H. *The Integrated Classroom*. New York: Basic Books, 1959.

Glasser, I. Schools for Scandal. The Bill of Rights and Public Education. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 1969, 51, 190-194.

Goss v. *Lopez*. 95 S. Ct. 729 (1975).

Gottlieb, D. Teaching and Students: The Views of Negro and White Teachers. *Sociology of Education*. 1964, 37, pp. 345-353.

Goulder, Helen P. The Natural History of the Education of the Black Child in the City. Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri, Social Science Institute, June, 1971.

Green, R.L. and Brydon, J. Investing in Youth: An approach to discipline in urban schools. In *Discipline and Learning*. Washington, D.C.: N.E.A., 1975.

Grossman, L., Clark, D., Lawenherz, L., and Pugh, C. Color the Problem Black--But Not Entirely. Journal of Teacher Education, 1971, 22, 489-493.

Hawkins v. Coleman. 376 F. Supp. 1330 N.D. Tex. (1974).

Jacobson, L. and Rosenthal, R. Pygmalion in the Classroom. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1968.

Johnson, B. Students Being Punished at Valley Spend Dull Day. The Courier-Journal, Louisville, Kentucky, April 14, 1977.

Johnson, James A., Jr. Ed. "On the Interface Between Low-Income, Urban Black Children and Their Teachers During the Early School Years: A Position Paper," Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, November, 1973.

Justin, N. Racial Balancing of Students and Faculty. Intellect, 101 (2344), 91-92.

Kittle, H.A. and Meares, H.O. In-House Suspension. NASSP Bulletin, 1976, 60 (397), 60-63.

Kron, K.H. and Faber, C.F. How Does the Teacher Cope with the Culture Shock? Clearing House, 1973, 47, 506-507.

Louisiana State Department of Education. Special Student Concerns Project. (Summary no. 1 of phase I). Baton Rouge, 1975. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 121875).

Manley-Casimir, M.E. Suspension, Expulsion and Procedural Due Process. Administrator's Notebook, 1972, 20, 1-4.

Mayer, R.R., King, C.E., Borders-Patterson, A., & McCullough, J.S. The Impact of School Desegregation in a Southern City. Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath & Co., 1974.

Miller, J.D. Student Suspensions in Boston: Derailing Desegregation. Inequality in Education, 1975, 20, 16-24.

Mills, N. Public Schools and the New Segregation Struggle. Equal Opportunity Review, 1975. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 109295).

Mizell, M.H. Desegregation in South Carolina. (Speech presented at symposium. Desegregation: Past, Present, and Future. Charleston, S.C., 1974. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 016356).

Mutimer, D.D. and Rosemier, R.A. Behavior Problems of Children as Viewed by Teachers and the Children Themselves. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1967, 31, 583-587.

Neill, S.B. Suspensions and Expulsions: Current Trends in Schools Policies and Programs. Arlington: National School Public Relations Assoc., 1976. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 127720).

Nichols, W. 'Time-Out' Rooms... Schools Use Them for Punishment and They're Meant to be Unpleasant. The Courier-Journal, Louisville, Kentucky, April 14, 1977.

Nichols, W. Writing and Writing Wins Redemption at Ballard. The Courier-Journal, Louisville, Kentucky, April 14, 1977.

Niemeyer, J.H. Importance of the Inner-City Teacher. In R.D. Strom (ed.), The Inner-City Classroom: Teacher Behaviors. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, 1966.

Noar, G. The Teacher and Integration. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1974.

Noete, C.N. The Supreme Court's New Rules for Due Process and How (Somehow) Schools Must Make Them Work. American School Board Journal, 1975, 162(3), 47-49.

O'Brian, D.M. In School Suspension: Is It the New Way to Punish Productively? The American School Board Journal, 1976, 163(3), 35-37.

Orfield, G. How to Make Desegregation Work: The Adaptation of Schools to Their Newly-Integrated Student Bodies. Law and Contemporary Problems, 1975, 39, 314-340.

Peretti, P.O. and Swenson, K. Bussing. Teachers' Attitudes and Interracial Discipline Problems. Illinois School Journal, 1975, 55(1), 49-55.

Pratt, T.M. A Positive Approach to Disruptive Behavior in Discipline In the Classroom. National Education Association, 1975.

Pugsley v. Sellmeyer. 158 Ark. 247, 250 S.W. 538 (1973).

Pushouts: New Outcasts From Public School. (Transcript of Options on Education. September 9, 1974). Washington, D.C.: George Washington University, Institute for Educational Leadership, 1974.

Rajpal, P.L. What Behavior Problems Do Teachers Regard as Serious? Phi Delta Kappan, 1972, 53, pp. 591-2.

Ramirez, Manuel and Taylor, Clark L. "Sex Role Determinants in Attitudes Toward Education Among Mexican-American Adolescents." Final Report 1967, (ED 309 957).

Report of the Task Force on Suspensions and Expulsions to the Joint Legislative Committee on Education. Louisiana State Department of Education, 1975, 74 pages.

Rosenfeld, Gerry. "Shut Those Thick Lips!": A Study of Slum School Failure. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1971.

Sanders, S.G. and Yarbrough, J.S. Bringing Order to an Inner-City Middle School. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 1976, 333-334.

Shinn, R. Cultural Conflict in the Classroom: Emphasis on Teachers as Classroom Communicators. *Contemporary Education*, 1971, 43, 21-25.

Stebbins, Robert A. "The Meaning of Disorderly Behavior: Teacher Definitions of a Classroom Situation," *Sociology of Education*, 44, p. 217-236 (Spring) 1970.

Stiavelli, R.E. and Sykes, D.E. The Guidance Clinic: An Alternative to Suspension. *NASSP Bulletin*, 1972, 56, 64-71.

Strom, R.D. Teacher Aspiration and Attitude. In R.D. Strom (ed.), *The Inner-City Classroom: Teacher Behaviors.* Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, 1966.

Student Suspensions (Hearing before the Subcommittee on Elementary Secondary, and Vocational Education of the Committee on Education and Labor. House of Representatives, Ninety-Fourth Congress, first session). Washington, D.C., 1972. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 122444).

Student Suspensions: Perilous Precedent? *Nation's Schools and Colleges*, 1975, 2, 51-52.

Sykes, M.P. Law and Order and Race in the Classroom. *Discipline and Learning: An Inquiry Into Student Teacher Relationships*. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1975.

Tasby v. *Estes*. 347 F. Supp. 945 (N.D. Tex (1971).

Tinker v. *Des Moines Community School District*. 393 U.S. 503, 511, 89, S. Ct. 733 (1969)

Thomas, D. Solving Discipline Problems Through Law-Related Education. *NASSP Bulletin*, 1976 15-19.

United States Commission on Civil Rights. *A Long Day's Journey Into Light*. Clearinghouse Publication 52, 1976. (a)

United States Commission on Civil Rights. *Fulfilling the Letter and Spirit of the Law*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1976. (b)

United States Commission on Civil Rights. *What Students Perceive*. (Clearing House Publication No. 24). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, undated.

Uredevoe, L.E. The effects of Desegregation Upon School Discipline. *Journal of Secondary Education*, 1967, 42.

Walden, J.C. Administrator's Liability in Pupil Discipline Cases. *National Elementary Principal*, 1975, 54(1), 104-106.

West Virginia State Board of Education v. *Barnette*, 319 U.S. 624, 637 (1943).

Wey, H., & Corey, J. *Action Patterns in School Desegregation. Bloomington, Ind.: Phi Delta Kappan, 1959.*

What Schools are Doing: A Roundup of New and Unusual School Practices. *Nation's Schools*, 1974, 93, 46-48.

Williams, Fredrick. "Psychological Correlates of Speech Characteristics: On Sounding Disadvantaged," *Journal of Speech and Hearing Research*; 13, p. 472-488, 1970.

Williams, Fredrick, Whitehead, S.L., and Miller, L.M. "Attitudinal Correlates of Children's Speech Characteristics," *USOE Research Report Project*, No. 0-0336, 1971, ED 052 213.

Williams, Fredrick, Whitehead, J.L., and Traupmann, Jane. Semantic Differential Scaling of Audiovisual Recordings of Children's Speech Samples. Technial Report, Austin: Texas University Center for Communication Research, July 1970.

Wood v. *Strickland*. 94 S. Ct. 1937 (1974).

Woodward, William D. and Salzer, Richard T. "Black Children's Speech and Teacher's Evaluations." *Urban Education*, p. 167-173, July - October, 1971.

Wynn, C. Black and White in Bibb County Classrooms. *Integrated Education*. 1971, 9(4), p. 10-16.

Ydof, M.G. Suspension and Expulsion of Black Students from the Public Schools: Academic Capital Punishment and the Constitution. *Law and Contemporary Problems*, 1975, 39, 375-411.